

# ESCHATOLOGICAL THEMES IN II THESSALONIANS 2:1-12

David J. Stephens

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD  
at the  
University of St Andrews



1976

Full metadata for this item is available in  
St Andrews Research Repository  
at:  
<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

Please use this identifier to cite or link to this item:  
<http://hdl.handle.net/10023/13841>

This item is protected by original copyright

Abstract of a Ph.D. Thesis submitted by

D.J. Stephens.

Eschatological Themes in II Thessalonians 2:1-12.

II Th. 2:1-12 is one of the most difficult passages in the N.T., treating, as it does, of eschatological themes which do not re-appear in Pauline Literature. The thesis an attempt to deal adequately with these themes. First though, the authenticity of II is considered (chp.1) and held to be by Paul. The eschatology of II.2 is then related to the eschatology of the two Thessalonian letters and it is concluded that a great deal of pre-Pauline material exists in the epistles, (chp.2).

A detailed study is made of the problem which gave rise to II.2 by looking at the pastoral concern of the Apostle, the statement which caused the difficulty (The Day of the Lord has come) and the means by which the error was spread. It is concluded that some at Thessalonica were reading 'present salvation' into the expression 'Day of the Lord', whilst at the same time not denying necessarily a future Parousia of Christ, (chp.4).

The next three chapters (5-7) look at the three themes which Paul uses to show the Day has not yet arrived; The Apostasy, The Anomos and The Katechon (ὄν). The Apostasy is viewed as religious and takes place within the bosom of the church. The Anomos theme is studied against the suggested backgrounds of historical precursors and the Belial (Beliar) myth. The



ProQuest Number: 10166444

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10166444

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

Abstract, Ph.D. Thesis, Stephens, continued.

conclusion reached is that the Antichrist (=Anomos) idea is the creation of the early church drawing upon elements found in the descriptions of earlier figures, e.g. Antiochus IV. The Anomos figure must be understood from texts showing Satanic possession since these aid an understanding of his relationship to Satan. Details within the passage of the appearance and activity of the Anomos throw light on the conception of the figure; he is set up as a mocking counterpart to Christ and his parousia, (chp.6).

The last chapter argues for a theocentric understanding of the Katechon with the Greek verb being translated 'restrain'. Paul is here referring to God and His restraint. The background to this lies in the thought of God holding onto evil and then allowing it to flourish for a set time. Evidence for this is provided and considered.

Paul has developed themes which counter an error in the early church. By dealing with events associated with the Day of the Lord he has shown that the Day cannot have come.

ESCHATOLOGICAL THEMES  
in  
II THESSALONIANS 2:1-12

by  
David J. Stephens B.D.

A Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
in the University of St. Andrews



Th 8796

I certify that the candidate David J. Stephens has fulfilled the conditions of the ordinance and regulations of the University of St. Andrews.

.....  
Professor of Divinity  
and Biblical Criticism  
University of Glasgow

I hereby certify that I have composed this thesis and that the work, of which it is a record, has been done by myself and has not been accepted in any previous application for a higher degree.

.....  
David J. Stephens, B.D.

CURRICULUM VITAE

I graduated in 1962 with the London University Bachelor of Divinity degree. I matriculated at St. Andrews University October 1967, being admitted under Ordinance General No. 12 with a view to a Ph.D. degree and have completed nine full terms of research.

### DEDICATION

To my wife who has shown exemplary patience and to my supervisor whose encouragement and standards have been the inspiration of this thesis.



# ABBREVIATIONS

## Abbreviations for Journals

<u>B.F.Th.</u>	Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie.
<u>Bib.</u>	Biblica.
<u>B.J.R.L.</u>	Bulletin of the John Rylands Library.
<u>B.Z.</u>	Biblische Zeitschrift.
<u>C.B.Q.</u>	Catholic Biblical Quarterly.
<u>Ev.Q.</u>	Evangelical Quarterly.
<u>Exp.</u>	The Expositor.
<u>E.T.</u>	The Expository Times.
<u>H.Th.R.</u>	Harvard Theological Review.
<u>J.B.L.</u>	Journal of Biblical Literature.
<u>J.H.S.</u>	Journal of Hellenistic Studies.
<u>J.Th.S.</u>	Journal of Theological Studies.
<u>N.T.</u>	Novum Testamentum.
<u>N.T.S.</u>	New Testament Studies.
<u>R.B.</u>	Revue Biblique.
<u>R.H.P.R.</u>	Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses.
<u>R.Q.</u>	Revue de Qumran.
<u>R.de S.R.</u>	Recherches de Science Religieuse.
<u>S.J.Th.</u>	Scottish Journal of Theology.
<u>Th.Q.</u>	Theologische Quartalschrift.
<u>Th.S.K.</u>	Theologische Studien und Kritiken.
<u>Th.Z.</u>	Theologische Zeitschrift.
<u>Z.A.W.</u>	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.
<u>Z.K.Th.</u>	Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie.
<u>Z.N.W.</u>	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.
<u>Z.Th.K.</u>	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche.

Abbreviations for Book Series.

Bl.N.T.C.	Black's New Testament Commentaries.
C.G.T.	Cambridge Greek Testament.
Cen. B.	Century Bible.
F.R.L.A.N.T.	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments.
H.Z.A.T.	Handbuch zum Alten Testament.
H.Z.N.T.	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament.
I.C.C.	The International Critical Commentary.
K.Z.N.T.	Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament.
N.Cen.B.	New Century Bible.
N.Cl.B.	New Clarendon Bible.
N.T.D.	Das Neue Testament Deutsch.
N.T. Suppl.	Supplements to Novum Testamentum.
Ps.V.T.G.	Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece.
S.B.Th.	Studies in Biblical Theology.
S.N.T.S.	Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph Series.
Th.F.	Theologische Forschung.

Abbreviations for Reference Books

<u>A.P.</u>	Charles, R.H., <u>The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English, Vol. II, Pseudepigrapha</u> , Oxford, 1913.
Bauer	Bauer, W., <u>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament</u> (transl. and ed. by W.F. Arndt and F.W. Gingrich), Chicago, 1957.
B.D.B.	Brown, F., Driver, S.R. and Briggs, C.A. <u>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</u> , Oxford, 1959.
Bl.-Deb.	Blass, F. and Debrunner, A., <u>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature</u> (transl. by R.W. Funk), Chicago, 1961.
<u>Enc.Bib.</u>	<u>The Encyclopaedia Biblica</u> (ed. J.S. Black and T.K. Cheyne), London, 1899-1903.
Grimm-Thayer	Grimm, C.L.W. and Thayer, J.H., <u>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament</u> , 4th edn., Edinburgh, 1896.
<u>H.D.B.</u>	<u>A Dictionary of the Bible</u> (ed. J. Hastings), 5 Vols., Edinburgh, 1898-1904.

- Hennecke            Hennecke, E., New Testament Apocrypha  
(ed. W. Schneemelcher, transl. by  
R. McL. Wilson, 2 Vols.), London, 1963 and 1965.
- I.B.                The Interpreter's Bible.
- I.D.B.            The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible  
(ed. G.A. Buttrick et al. 4 Vols.), Nashville,  
Tenn., 1962.
- J.B.C.            The Jerome Bible Commentary (ed. R.E. Brown,  
J.A. Fitzmyer and R.E. Murphy), London, 1968.
- L.A.E.            Deissmann, A., Light from the Ancient East.
- Liddell-Scott      Liddell, H.G. and Scott, R., A Greek-English  
Lexicon (rev. and augmented by H.S. Jones),  
Oxford, 1961.
- Lohse              Lohse, E., Die Texte aus Qumran, München, 1964.
- Moule              Moule, C.F.D., An Idiom - Book of New Testament  
Greek, Cambridge, 1960.
- Moulton -          Moulton, J.H. and Milligan, G., The Vocabulary  
Milligan            of the Greek Testament, London, 1930.
- Moulton-Turner    Moulton, J.H. and Turner, N., A Grammar of New  
Testament Greek, Vol. III, Syntax, Edinburgh,  
1963.
- R.G.G.            Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart,  
3rd edn., Tübingen, 1961.
- Strack -            Strack, H.L. and Billerbeck, P., Kommentar zum  
Billerbeck        Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash, 4 Vols.,  
München, 1922-1928.
- T.D.N.T.        Theological Dictionary of the New Testament  
(T.W.N.T.)        (=Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament,  
ed. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, transl. by  
G.W. Bromiley, 9 Vols.), Grand Rapids, Mich.,  
1964-1973.
- T.U.              Texte und Untersuchungen.
- Vermes             Vermes, G., The Dead Sea Scrolls in English,  
rev. edn., London, 1968.

### Commentators

The following commentators are cited by surname throughout the thesis. Full details of the works are to be found in the Bibliography.

Best  
Dibelius  
von Dobschütz  
Frame  
Masson  
Rigaux

Patristic commentators are cited by name only since references are made to their comments on II.2:1ff.

Chrysostom, John in Migne, Patrologia Graeca (=P.G.), LXII, Cols. 481-488.

Theodore of Mopsuestia, P.G., LXVI, Cols. 932-936.

Theodoret of Cyr, P.G., LXXXII, Cols. 661-668.

John of Damascus, P.G., XCV, Cols. 921-924.

Oecumenius, P.G., CXIX, Cols. 115-124.

Theophylactus, P.G., CXXIV, Cols. 1337-1346.

Other comments are found in

Augustine, De Civ. Dei (Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum, XXX, ed. E. Hofmann), Vienna.

Cyril of Jerusalem, Cat. XV, P.G., XXXIII.

All other commentators are cited in full on the first occasion and subsequently by surname only.

Citations of Qumran literature follow J.A. Sanders, 'Palestinian Manuscripts 1947-1972', Journal of Semitic Studies 24 (1973) 76ff.

U.B.S. The Greek New Testament (United Bible Societies, ed.

K.Aland and others), London, 1966.

# C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction .. .. .	1
Chapter 1 The Authenticity of II Thessalonians	3
Chapter 2 The Eschatology of I and II Thessalonians .. .. .	27
Chapter 3 The Text and Translation of II Thessalonians 2:1-12 .. .. .	56
Chapter 4 An Eschatological Problem Facing the Thessalonian Community .. .. .	63
Chapter 5 The Eschatological Theme of Apostasy	131
Chapter 6 The Man of Lawlessness: The Antichrist	153
Chapter 7 The <u>Katechon</u> and <u>Katechōn</u> .. .. .	304
Bibliography .. .. .	372

INTRODUCTION

A reading of II Thessalonians (II) reveals that the main point of the letter is concerned with eschatological matters. Immediately after a thanksgiving, 1:3ff., which itself contains allusions to the eschatological bliss of those who endure opposition to the faith, vv. 4,5, the author of the epistle launches into this area of theology. He is not only concerned, for dogmatic reasons, to correct false opinions but also from a pastoral interest, to provide a solid basis from which the church can grow. To do this he reminds the Christian community of views which he expressed when he was with them earlier, 2:5.

Little, if any, disagreement will be provoked by this brief and general analysis of the letter. Major problems arise when we attempt to delineate the precise concerns and difficulties which faced the writer and his readers. This is due to the enigmatic and sketchy manner in which the author writes and the grammatical and syntactical problems of the text. Chapter two, for example, presents a bewildering number of eschatological thoughts and ideas, which encouraged even those commentators who were writing nearer to the time of the letter's composition (or editing) to put forward different interpretations. Differences of opinion centre around the 'Man of Lawlessness', the scope and nature of 'The Apostasy' and the function of the Katechon. Moreover, even if a satisfactory answer may be found to the question 'To whom or what

did these eschatological ideas refer?' other questions remain, e.g. 'Why did the author wish to allude to eschatological features in the way he did?' The passage in chapter 2:1ff. remains today as intriguing and baffling as ever.

All we, as others before us, can ever hope to do is to try and provide a possible and plausible understanding of the passage. Although other writers and commentators have suggested explanations a further attempt requires little justification. Chapter two is first century eschatology (irrespective of authorship) and it is clearly important to define the views held at that time.

## CHAPTER ONE

### THE AUTHENTICITY OF II THESSALONIANS<sup>1</sup>

We start by noting that there are some important scholars who reject the Pauline authorship of II<sup>2</sup>. These include Bultmann<sup>3</sup>, Schoeps<sup>4</sup>, Bornkamm<sup>5</sup>, the French commentator Masson<sup>6</sup>, Marxsen<sup>7</sup> and very recently Trilling<sup>8</sup>. In one way or another they have been impressed by the erudite essay of W. Wrede<sup>9</sup>. This scholar shifted the main area of dispute away from the alleged differences in eschatology between I and II, to a critical and thorough assessment of the language and style of the Thessalonian correspondence. However, before we consider these views, we should look at the alleged differences in eschatology between the two letters.

#### A. Eschatological Differences

It is suggested that II.2:3f. is at variance with the imminence of the Parousia, as outlined in I.4:13ff. and 5:1ff<sup>10</sup>. It is felt that the time-schedule of events in II precludes any thought of the sudden coming of Christ and therefore points to a later church situation when the need arose to dampen down 'over-expectant' Christian attitudes<sup>11</sup>. This line of argument denies that there is any link between I.5:1ff. and II.2:1ff. - in particular

I.5:1, Περὶ δὲ τῶν χρόνων καὶ τῶν καιρῶν,  
ἀδελφοί, οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχετε ὑμῖν γράφεσθαι,

and the signs of Apostasy, Anomos and Katechon, II.2:3,



6ff<sup>12</sup>. We have to agree that the two texts do not necessarily present the same ideas, but the expression τῶν χρόνων καὶ τῶν καιρῶν includes End-time features. This parallels the statement in Acts 1:6f. where Jesus replies to the disciples question about the restoration of the kingdom to Israel, Οὐχ ὑμῶν ἐστὶν γινῶναι χρόνους ἢ καιροὺς οὓς ὁ πατὴρ ἔθετο ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ. The basic objection which is being raised here is without any real force since in eschatological passages we often find imminency<sup>e</sup> linked with signs. Such apparent incompatibility may appear strange to us but for earlier writers it was part of eschatological belief. Didache 16 provides an example with its juxtaposition: Γρηγορεῖτε ὑπὲρ τῆς ζωῆς ὑμῶν ... οὐ οἶδατε τὴν ὥραν ἐν ᾗ ὁ κυρ. ἥρῳν ἔρχεται<sup>13</sup>. This statement is followed immediately by an account of signs which will indicate the end of the age and include lawlessness, false prophets and a world deceiver. This passage appears to be based on earlier Markan and Matthaean syntheses which contain the same paradoxical features, Mk.13:14ff., 35ff.; Mt. 24:15ff., 32ff. It would be more appropriate if those who deny Pauline authorship for II on eschatological grounds, did so by arguing that II.2:1ff. is an illustration of I.5:1ff. and not a contradiction. However, if this is so, we have forfeited any reliable grounds on which to allege differences.

Essential to this position is the assumption that I shows that Paul believed in an "any moment" appearance of Christ. Whether or not Paul believed he would be alive when Christ came, I.4:15, he did accept that the church had

to wait for Christ, I.1:10, that some would die, I.4:13ff. and that the Day should not be unexpected by the "sons of light", I.5:6f. Why should it not be unexpected? The only satisfactory answer can be that Christians are expected to read the signs, v.1, that herald the approaching Day of the Lord. For the "sons of darkness" the Day will overtake them all too swiftly, as it will the "sons of light" who are 'asleep'. We should note that Paul is not talking about imminency here but the manner of the coming of Christ. It is sudden, like a thief in the night, 5:2, even though the chapter contains hints of imminency; v.6, "let us watch", cf. vv.8,10,23. To sum up therefore, the alleged eschatological differences between the two letters are less than appear at first sight and are in general accord with early Christian thinking.

From a more positive angle there is the interesting use of the singular imperfect in II.2:5, ἔλεγεν<sup>14</sup>. It is reasonable to assume that a later editor would have difficulties in imagining and creating personal Pauline touches. Such a person could read other letters and I in particular, and borrow both expressions and ideas which were common to Paul but he could not know or think of everything. For example, in II.2:5<sup>15</sup> we might well have expected an aorist plural, I.2:2 or singular, I.3:5 instead of an imperfect. But on the assumption an imperfect was chosen, why did an editor or author choose the singular?<sup>16</sup> We would have expected Silvanus to be associated with Paul in the community's instruction. In I.5:1 Paul says "we have no need to write to you ... "; a strong case for a

similar plural here. In I chapters 1 and 2 the plural is used of the initial activity of Paul, whilst in I.2:18, 3:5, where Paul uses the singular, he adds the personal pronoun ἐγώ for stress. This could hardly have escaped the attention of an editor and imitator who has, if II is a forgery, performed such a good job.

The use of the imperfect accords well with the implication of I.5:1, namely that Paul had taught the community about events leading up to the Parousia<sup>17</sup>. It was part of his basic (cf. I.1:9f.) and no doubt, inherited teaching when he set up churches. The problem was that the community found it difficult to take in so much at once. This thesis will attempt to show that this was only to be expected from a newly converted group of pagans<sup>18</sup>. Unused to apocalyptic thought categories they found teaching on the subject difficult to accept and digest.

If the church at Thessalonica was predominantly Jewish, then this argument is of no consequence but there are reasons for thinking that this was not so. It is interesting that we find no O.T. quotations in the Thessalonian correspondence as we do in other epistles, cf. Rom 10:16,19; 11:26; I Cor. 2:16<sup>19</sup>. If there were a great number of Jews within the community we would surely have expected Paul to have appealed to the Scriptures and known apocalyptic literature (I Cor. 2:9?) for proof of his arguments, especially when dealing with eschatological matters. He makes allusions to the O.T.; indeed II.1:7ff. can only be described as a mosaic of O.T. phrases and thought and in

II.2:4 he comes close to quoting Dan. 11:36, but the fact that he does not do so must be because he realised that it would not carry sufficient weight with his readers<sup>20</sup>. The reason for these allusions is that Paul, assuming for the moment that he wrote II, found it impossible to avoid such expressions and hints for he had been trained in the atmosphere and language of the O.T. To sum up once more, we can state that in the two letters we find complementary not contradictory teaching. Eschatological differences do not furnish adequate grounds on which to dispute Pauline authorship.

#### B. Literary Difficulties

The second argument is very simple in outline. It suggests that whilst new material exists in II, a great deal of what remains after we have extracted it, is so similar to I in content, language and style, that we should think of II as a deliberate imitation. The original protagonist of this view was Wrede. By setting out the parallels between the two epistles, he concluded that only a literary use of I could explain the problem. He conjectured that an unknown author wrote II at the close of the first or the start of the second century A.D.<sup>21</sup>

It is unnecessary in this introductory chapter to review all the arguments which Wrede used to support his contention, but we cannot <sup>simply</sup> ignore them <sup>since</sup> ~~either~~ as they are the basis upon which those who deny or have doubts about authenticity build their views. It is not out of place at this point to remark upon the fact that whilst most commentators on this

epistle accept Pauline authorship some, with reservations about the arguments for it, use it only as a working hypothesis.

To return to Wrede's hypothesis. The epistolary form of I is followed closely by II, but it is never slavishly 'copied'. Kümmel notes that "the parallels are not in the same sequence and extend to only about a third of the Epistle"<sup>22</sup>. Phrases and words which do agree with I are intertwined with new ones in a delicately balanced way<sup>23</sup>. The linguistic problems raised by the Pastoral Letters are not in evidence here. Moreover of the new words in II, (i.e. not in I), most can be traced elsewhere in Paul, cf. ἀποκάλυψις 1:7; I Cor. 1:7; ἐνιστάναί 2:2; Rom. 8:38; καταργέω 2:8; Rom. 3:3. Others are found in the New Testament writings as a whole, cf. ἀποστασία 2:3; Acts 21:21; ἄτοκος , 3:2; Lk. 23:41; κρίσις , 1:5; Mt. 10:15. Only a few are peculiar to II, cf. τίνω 1:9; ἀτάκτως 3:6,11. These last two groups are very small and yet not so small that we are led to suspect forgery. We must always allow for fresh words in any letter, since the content of a letter may require new words, (e.g. ἀποστασία 2:3 in II), and the readers may understand words not suitable to another group, (e.g. παρουσία and ἐπιφάνεια II.2:8). Frame demonstrated some time ago that of the 146 words common to both epistles all but four are found in one or more of the major epistles<sup>24</sup>. This is to be expected if the letter is genuine.

However recently Trilling has discussed the question of authenticity with renewed vigour in another study which shows considerable indebtedness to Wrede. His form-critical approach to II.1:1f., 3-12 and 2:1-12 have extended the argument of that earlier scholar, although he still relies heavily on an analysis of style and vocabulary for his conclusion that II is a pseudepigraphon<sup>25</sup>. He also investigates not only the eschatological but theological differences between true Pauline epistles and II which he believes lead to the same conclusion<sup>26</sup>. Not that we must consider a pseudepigraphon a falsification; it is rather an authoritative realisation of the teaching of Paul<sup>27</sup>. Yet in spite of Trilling's arguments certain problems are created rather than solved.

i) According to Trilling II is much further from Paul's thought than the Pastorals<sup>28</sup>.

This appears to be highly questionable since one of the previous criticisms has been that II imitates I!

ii) The theology of II (dealt with in section 4 of Trilling's book) in no way contradicts either I or Pauline thought. It can hardly be said to reflect a later time. The Christology and general tenor of II point to primitive Christian times.

iii) A definite situation and community seem indicated by II.2:2; 3:6ff<sup>29</sup>.

iv) There is much more to be said for a theory which regards II as dependent on I



(which Trilling rejects)<sup>30</sup> on the basis of a great deal of similarity in thought and style.

v) Why is II.2:3ff. included in the letter? If an author is dealing with the delay of the Parousia could he not have expressed himself or used his material in a clearer way?

Even so II.2:2ff. deals with the question

'Why the Day cannot be here', not 'What has delayed it.' <sup>And further what</sup> ~~What earlier tradition too~~ is the author re-interpreting?<sup>31</sup>

vi) Trilling has ignored the work of stylistic analyses which have suggested other explanations. Recently S. Michaelson and A.Q. Morton<sup>32</sup> have reached quite the opposite conclusion to Trilling by stating that I and II (non-authentic) are by the same hand. K. Grayston and G. Herdan<sup>33</sup> earlier argued, on the basis of hapax legomena, that when I and II (together) are compared with other Pauline letters they furnish the lowest percentage of new words relative to the total number (29.5%: average 32-34%). From this they concluded that both are in agreement with "their being of true Pauline style, though not necessarily coming from the same hand".

To sum up, we have mentioned the problems posed by those who reject authenticity, but the brief look at these arguments does not suggest of necessity an imitation or pseudepigraphon theory. On the contrary the parallels and differences are of a type which are to be expected if II is a genuine letter which was sent to the same church soon after I.

Moving now from internal considerations are there any external references which might support the Pauline case? At the turn of the century and earlier it was fashionable to quote early Christian writings as a fairly reliable guide to the authorship and date of an epistle<sup>34</sup>. The difficulty encountered by such a view is the tacit assumption that all possible allusions have to originate from a N.T. written source. This takes no account of the growth of oral and written traditions within the early church, which can be quite separate from 'canonical sources'. The problem for the scholar is whether an alleged parallel in an early church father comes from the N.T., an unknown oral or written tradition, or a combination of both. We shall glance only briefly at suggested parallels.

In the Ascension of Isaiah<sup>35</sup> 4:2ff. the writer uses apocalyptic ideas similar to those in II.2 and Rev.13 and 17. Beliar, described as Antichrist, will control the world and act as a lawless king, βασιλέως ἀνόρου. He will be accepted by people because of his miraculous exploits, cf. II.2:3,9. Didache<sup>36</sup>, early 2nd or late 1st century seems to exhibit echoes of Thessalonians, καὶ τότε



φανήσεται ὁ κοσμοπλανήης ὡς υἱὸς θεοῦ καὶ  
ποιήσῃ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα, 16:4; cf. II. 2:9;  
Mt. 24:24; Rev. 13:2,13<sup>37</sup> (late 1st century A.D.)

The use of ἐνεργέω Ep. Barnabas<sup>38</sup> (the same period  
as Didache) 2:1 can hardly be a reflection of II.2:7,

σημῶν οὐκ οὐσῶν πονηρῶν καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐνεργ-  
ούντος ἔχοντος τὴν ἐξουσίαν, ὁφείλομεν κ.λ.<sup>39</sup> Ignatius,

Ad. Ephes. 8:1 has the expression μὴ οὐκ τις ὕμῶν

ἐξαπατάτω, cf. II.2:3a whilst the second century  
Apocalypse of Peter<sup>40</sup> has ideas parallel with II.2:3,

ἐκεῖνοι δὲ υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπωλείας γενήσονται and  
καὶ κρίνῃ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀνομίας.

It is likely that all these documents reflect  
current apocalyptic beliefs which go back to various earlier  
sources for their inspiration, and one such original source  
could be II.2:1ff. However, these do not prove Pauline  
authorship. If I Clement 38:4 is based on II it too only  
proves the existence of the source prior to that time, ca.  
95 A.D.<sup>41</sup>.

So far we have examined authenticity in relation  
to language, style and eschatological content and concluded  
that Pauline authorship remains the most likely solution.  
The expected Parousia is present in II.2:4ff. as are also  
instructions to settle down and get on with daily living,  
II.3:6ff.; cf. I.4:9ff.; 5:12ff. Yet it is precisely  
at this point that a new difficulty is encountered. Why  
does II follow on I so closely in time, as is commonly  
assumed by many scholars?<sup>42</sup> This question usually pre-  
supposes that both letters cover the same area of  
eschatological thought. In a very general way they do,

but they also show major but not necessarily contradictory differences. In I the writer deals with the state of the dead at the time of the Parousia and the fears of the living about the recent Christian dead missing the event, 4:13ff. In II the problem is quite different. For reasons given in chapter four it will be argued that some in the church community had rejected or misunderstood (perhaps both?) the meaning of the Day of the Lord, 2:2. Because of their recent conversion and Paul's short mission visit, the Thessalonian Christians had had too little time to assimilate all that they had been taught, II.2:5. To correct this the writer outlines basic and earlier teaching to show that "the Day has not come". In addition to this we should note that whereas Paul says he does not wish to have them ignorant, I.4:13, perhaps implying that he had not covered that aspect of the future, or at least in any detail, in II.2:1ff. the opposite is true. He is re-iterating what he has said already. Is it surprising that a second letter should be sent so quickly on the heels of the first? If the church had already had problems with the future, (as I shows), it is not unlikely that more would arise in Paul's absence.

Nevertheless some scholars have felt the force of the objection and have provided alternative solutions. These have centred around trying to define more specifically the readership of the letters. Harnack argued that II was addressed to the Jewish section of the church which he regarded as a sort of 'annex' to the main Christian community<sup>43</sup>. Dibelius<sup>44</sup> was attracted by this idea

although in the third edition of his commentary he estimated that I was a private letter and II, in view of its more formal characteristics, was sent to the community with full apostolic authority<sup>45</sup>.

Attractive though these explanations are<sup>46</sup>, they suffer from serious drawbacks. Was the original address of the letter different from that which we now have? If so, when was it changed and why? Does not II.2:15 suppose that an earlier letter was sent to the whole community and not just a particular group? Can we go along with the idea of Harnack that Paul, the champion of unity, would write in such a divisive manner?<sup>47</sup> Admittedly Paul's thoughts on unity emerge from the two (or more) letters sent to the Corinthians which were written a few years later, but it is likely that he had already formed his views on the subject since I.5:12ff. contains an implicit belief in the unity of a church community.

It certainly seems more probable that Paul wrote to the whole church, since all the community was involved in the life of the church but that at the same time II had special relevance to a (minority?) group within this community. There is nothing to warrant our supposing this or any other group to be Jewish in character. It is better to think of a group made up of recently converted Gentiles who are trying to come to grips with their new faith. The author of II sees them as a potentially harmful group and writes to them to correct their errant theology. At the same time he gives no hint of this group of people being guilty of 'heresy' or deliberately deviating from the truth, as was the case with the Galatians<sup>48</sup>.

T.W. Manson approached the problem in a different way<sup>49</sup>. He argued that the situation of II is assumed in I. To support this contention he urged the following important considerations. The severe trials of II.1:4ff. are past in I.2:4. The charge to work, I.4:11, presupposes some previous occasion when this was not happening, i.e. II.3:6-13. Again II.3:17 is pointless unless II was written before I. Timothy, the bearer, authenticates the style. Finally I.5:1 assumes the readers knew II.2.

The theory is, superficially, 'extremely plausible, but the passages do not require the solution provided by Manson. The troubles mentioned in II.1:4ff. can quite naturally follow those referred to in I.3:3ff. Laziness might well have been a common occurrence within the community and II.3:6-13 can be seen as a stronger and further reminder on the subject. Timothy, it should be noted, is 'co-writer' of the letter not its bearer, and finally II.2 can well illustrate I.5:1 as much as the other way round. On the other hand if the theory is correct it does explain why the two letters were written so closely together; the second, (i.e. our I), comments on the first (II) which was sent to the Thessalonians. However as the arguments of Manson are not conclusive, there seems to be little reason for us to change the order. Indeed for this thesis, even if the two were reversed, it would not affect materially our understanding of II.2:1ff.

In recent times W. Schmithals<sup>50</sup> has geared himself to a new study of the Thessalonian epistles. In an article, written in 1960, he linked I and II, as well as Philippians,

to Corinthians and Galatians and argued that they were written during the period of the third missionary journey<sup>51</sup>. I was written after Corinthians C, (= II Cor. 2:14 - 6:13; 7:2-4), and closely associated in time with II. He believed that the error dealt with in II was paralleled in I Cor.15. He has since argued that I and II are composite works, originally compiled from four pieces of correspondence sent by Paul to the Thessalonians. He has made the following classification:<sup>53</sup>

Thess. A. II.1:1-12 + 3:6-18.

Thess. B. I.1:1-2:12 + 4:3 - 5:28.

Thess. C. II.2:13-14 + 2:1-12 + 2:15 - 3:5 + 3:17-18.

Thess. D. I.2:13 - 4:2.

With due acknowledgment to Wrede, who 'suggested' the four-fold scheme, he dismisses as improbable the imitation theory. Instead his own scheme is a new way of accounting for material which appears to be so Pauline. Bjerkelund has subjected Schmithals' theory to a close analysis in his book on Parakalō clauses<sup>54</sup> in the Papyri and Pauline literature. On the basis of his studies he asserts that clauses beginning with parakalō or even erōtaō mark formal units of material and consequently we cannot split up passages in the way Schmithals does. These clauses, e.g. II.2:1ff. provide a unity to the Thessalonian correspondence and he charges Schmithals with ignoring this fact.

This is only one objection to Schmithals' views. There are other questions to which Schmithals must give satisfactory answers if his view is to be accepted. Why, for instance, did the editor of the four originals, wish



to add a second thanksgiving at II.2:13 after that at 1:3ff. (cf. I.1:2ff.; 2:13)? If, as we must suppose, an editor is attempting to achieve a unity for the reconstructed letter, why did he leave it in this parlous state. It is difficult to see two conclusions in II.3:16 and 3:17 as Schmithals does. If we compare 3:16ff. with II Cor. 13:11ff. and also note the use of a similar semi-conclusion at II.2:16, which Schmithals ignores, we can find a parallel example. In fact when we set out Thessalonians in the way he suggests it appears to us that the transitions for which he argues are worse than those at present in the N.T. The analysis is so arbitrary in its formulation that it becomes totally unacceptable. The contents of II.1 and 2 are so similar in style that it is more likely they were written together, than that they were the result of a fusion of two earlier letters. If Schmithals' conclusions are correct, he ought also to account for the haphazard process of editing and suggest a stage at which this took place in the history of the Pauline Corpus.

We can now pass on to consider the question of the date of the epistle. If it is Pauline, then it is probably to be dated around 50-51 A.D.<sup>55</sup> and written from Corinth<sup>56</sup>, when the apostle was there on his second missionary journey. Schmithals disagrees with this dating. He finds that the close relationship of the epistles with Galatians and II Corinthians, where Paul is combatting Gnostic views, forces us to consider that the letters were written on the third missionary journey. This conclusion is further strengthened, he believes, by the assertion that

I Cor. 15 and II.2 deal with similar errors. However, he is in danger of finding too many Gnostic opponents for Paul. It is unlikely that Jewish-Gnosticism is to the fore in I Cor. 15<sup>57</sup> and even more improbable that Gnosticism is present at Thessalonica, at least on the evidence we have<sup>58</sup>. We could deduce tendencies towards a heresy which was later called Gnosticism (a very difficult term to define)<sup>59</sup> but nothing more.

What inclines us towards a date of 50-51 A.D. are the references to the foundation visit and mission preaching of Paul and his companions, I.1:5,9; 2:2,8f.,12, phrases such as "you know" or "you remember", I.1:5; II.2:5, and the general tone of the letter which moves quickly from one thing to another. It suggests a close relationship between the original mission and the letter's composition. If the letter or letters were composed and/or edited from a later standpoint we might well have expected a more theological work, at least oblique references to the passage of time, and more detail about the church situation. However, even if Schmithals is correct in his analysis of I and II our exegesis of II.2 will again be little affected.

We have considered briefly the authenticity of II and during it our own position has become clear. Arguments in favour of its genuineness may not be overwhelming but they do still point to authenticity as the best working hypothesis<sup>60</sup>. We shall assume that II was a letter written not long after Paul had left Thessalonica and has, as its main thrust, eschatological matters. Although eschatological teaching had formed a part in I

the founder of the church still required another letter to recall beliefs which had been mentioned during the mission time in view of the current problem (II.2:2).



<sup>1</sup>We consider I Thessalonians to be Pauline. B. Rigaux, p.120, writes "en effet cette authenticité est acceptée actuellement par tous les critiques". Similarly W.G. Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament (transl. by A.J. Mattill), London, 1966, p.185. "There can be no justifiable doubt that all of I Thess. is of Pauline origin". Amongst the commentators who share this view are E. von Dobschütz, J.E. Frame, M. Dibelius, Rigaux and most recently E. Best. K.-G. Eckart 'Der zweite echte Brief des Apostels Paulus an die Thessalonicher', Z.Th.K. 58 (1961) 30-44 maintains that I Thess. is a piecing together of two genuine epistles sent to the Thessalonians: 1.2:13-16; 3:5; 4:1-8, 10<sup>b</sup>-12, 18 and 5:12-22, 27 are non-Pauline sections. G. Friedrich, 'I Thessalonicher 5, 1-11, der apologetisch<sup>12</sup> Einschub eines Späteren', Z.Th.K. 70 (1973) 288-315 rejects 1.5:1-11 because it contradicts 1:4:13ff. and deals with the Parousia-delay motif, so it owes its origin to a later editor. Much earlier R. Scott, The Pauline Epistles. A Critical Study, Edinburgh, 1909, pp.125f., 215 supposed that only the first three chapters of I Thess. were genuine and that even these were only the language of reminiscence constituting a suitable framework for the apocalyptic message. All three ignore the essentially Pauline language of I (cf. W.G. Kümmel, 'Das literarische und geschichtliche Problem des ersten Thessalonicherbriefes' in Neotestamentica et Patristica, Freundesgabe O. Cullmann (N.T. Suppl., 6), Leiden, 1962, pp.213-227 and do not give sufficient weight to pre-Pauline tradition which can account for linguistic differences, see Chp. 2, passim. The supposed eschatological difference between I.4 and I.5 is dealt with later in chp. 1.

<sup>2</sup>For a history of criticism, Rigaux, pp. 124ff. For a briefer and more recent survey, W. Schmithals, 'Die Thessalonicherbriefe als Briefkomposition' in Zeit und Geschichte, Dankesgabe an R. Bultmann (ed. E. Dinkler, Tübingen, 1964, pp. 295-311.

<sup>3</sup>R. Bultmann, The Theology of the New Testament (transl. by K. Grobel, Vol. II), London, 1955, p.142.

<sup>4</sup>H.J. Schoeps, Paul (transl. by H. Knight), London, 1961, p.51.

<sup>5</sup>G. Bornkamm, 'Paulus, Apostel' in R.G.G., V, col. 167.

<sup>6</sup>C. Masson, pp.9ff. He rejects it on theological grounds as has H. Braun, 'Zur nichtpaulischen Herkunft des zweiten Thessalonicherbriefes', Z.N.W. 44 (1952/53) 152ff. The moralizing tone of II and the lack of joy indicates a post-Pauline time.

<sup>7</sup>W. Marxsen, Introduction to the New Testament (transl. by G. Buswell), Oxford, 1968, p.44.

<sup>8</sup>W. Trilling, Untersuchungen zum 2. Thessalonicherbrief (Erfurter Theologische Studien, 27), Leipzig, 1972.

<sup>9</sup>'Die Echtheit des zweiten Thessalonicherbriefs untersucht' in T.U. (N.F. 9, 2), Leipzig, 1903. For an appreciation of the influence of this essay and its main points see Rigaux, pp.128f.

<sup>10</sup>D.E.H. Whiteley has recently emphasized this point, Thessalonians (N.Cl.B.), Oxford, 1969, pp.100f. He suggests we have two irreconcilable accounts of what happened at the original evangelization. However, he still opts for Pauline authorship.

<sup>11</sup>So Masson, pp.10f. For him the eschatological contradiction is decisive. II.2:1ff. suits the end period of the first century A.D., when a disciple of Paul had to deal with imminent expectations of the Parousia. This does not apply if ἐνέστηκεν, II.2:2 has nothing to do with futuristic expectations cf. chp. 2. Wrede, op. cit., pp.34f. also thinks the ideas of The Apostasy and Man of Lawlessness are foreign to the Apostle's way of thinking.

<sup>12</sup>Masson, ibid.

<sup>13</sup>From Mt. 24:44. A. Oepke, Die Briefe an die Thessalonicher (N.T.D.), Göttingen, 1953, p.152. quite rightly says the co-existence of the two tendencies (imminency and signs before the End) belongs to the essence of Apocalyptic, cf. Mt. 24:42 with 24:6.

<sup>14</sup>We should translate, 'used to say' with von Dobschütz and Rigaux, ad loc. C.H. Griblin, The Threat to Faith: An Exegetical and Theological Re-examination of 2 Thessalonians 2 (Analecta Biblica, 31), Rome, 1967, pp.153ff. translates (wrongly) 'explained'. No doubt this was done, but it does not convey the actual sense of the word.

<sup>15</sup>Cf. also II.1:7  $\mu\epsilon\theta' \eta\mu\omega\checkmark$  and see von Dobschütz's comments ad loc.

<sup>16</sup>For a discussion on the use of 'we and I' see chp. 2, fn. 9.

<sup>17</sup>So K. Staab, Die Thessalonicherbriefe (Regensburger N.T.), Regensburg, 1965, ad loc., writes "the remark shows that Paul in his first stay in a city included the momentous eschatological question".

<sup>18</sup>Marxsen, Introduction, pp.32f., thinks that we should consider only a Gentile Christian church at Thessalonica. This ignores Acts 17:1ff. which suggests (and there is no reason to doubt its sentiment), that some Jews believed.

<sup>19</sup>On the use of the O.T. in the Thessalonian letters see Rigaux, pp. 94f. For the O.T. in Paul, E.E. Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament, London, 1957. He cites 93 O.T. quotations in Paul but none for I or II and only 2 allusions; Dan. 7:13 = I.4:17; Dan. 11:36 = II.2:4, p.154, although Rigaux finds more.

<sup>20</sup>There are other reasons which point to a predominantly Gentile community:

- (i) I.1:9f. has a reference to idols. This is only appropriate if applied to Gentiles.
- (ii) The use of words such as *καρυσία* and *ἐπιφάνεια* suggest a Hellenistic readership. See chps. 4 and 6.
- (iii) I.4:1-5 contains instructions more applicable to Gentiles.
- (iv) I.2:14 implies that fellow-citizens are Gentiles.
- (v) Possibly the Western variant of Acts 17:4, indicating 'heathen Gentiles' (*σεβορένων* καὶ ἑλλήνων A D pc vg), is genuine. The Lukan account of the mission in Acts has ignored evidence gleaned from I and II.

<sup>21</sup>Op. cit., pp. 28-32, 113f.

<sup>22</sup>Introduction, p.189.

<sup>23</sup>The style and vocabulary of the letters has been studied extensively by Rigaux, pp. 80-94, 132ff. Frame's earlier and briefer section remains still a masterpiece of lucidity, pp. 28-34. More recently Trilling, op. cit., pp. 46-66 has made his own study of the literary character of the epistle and from it criticizes Rigaux's conclusions, see pp. 37ff., 48ff.

<sup>24</sup>p.29.

<sup>25</sup>Pp. 67ff. cf. M. Rist, 'Pseudepigraphy and the Early Christians' in Studies in the New Testament and Early Christianity (ed. D.E. Aune, N.T. suppl., 33), Leiden, 1972, pp. 82ff.

<sup>26</sup>Pp. 110-132. He considers Greek words (e.g. *εὐαγγέλιον*, *ἀλήθεια* etc.), teaching and tradition, information about the Apostle's way of life, the Christian life, eschatology and the character of God and Christ in the Epistle.

<sup>27</sup>Pp. 157f.

<sup>28</sup>P. 154 n.75.

<sup>29</sup>As against Trilling's denial, p.126.

<sup>30</sup>Pp.42. We wonder why II, alleged by Trilling to be a Christian letter in the form of a Pauline letter, is closest to the Sitz im Leben of I and yet the latter is not the basis of the former, when most scholars who reject authenticity have previously found the literary 'relationship' the real crux of the problem. Cf. too, Trilling, p.136.

<sup>31</sup>Pp. 78-92.

<sup>32</sup>'Last Words: A Test of Authorship for Greek Writers', N.T.S. 18 (1970/71) 192-208. They have built up a list of statistics by analysing the end words of sentences into nouns, Aor. verbs, Non-Aor. verbs and other. Data for I and II is found in Table 5A, p.207. For a criticism of their pre-suppositions behind and interpretation of the statistics, P.F. Johnson, 'The Use of Statistics in the Analysis of the Characteristics of Pauline Writing', N.T.S. 20 (1973/74) 92-100. Cf. too A.Q. Morton-J. McLeman Christianity and the Computer, London, 1964 and H.K. McArthur, 'Καί Frequency in Greek Letters', N.T.S. 15 (1968/69) 339-349. I and II show a high Καί frequency when compared with Rom., I and II, Cor., and Gal.

<sup>33</sup>'The Authorship of the Pastorals in the Light of Statistical Linguistics', N.T.S. 6 (1959/60) 1-15, p.9. It is a pity they did not deal with I and II separately.

<sup>34</sup>Cf. The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers (Oxford Society of Historical Theology), Oxford, 1905. For an example related to II Thessalonians see p.95.

<sup>35</sup>On the form and date see J. Flemming-H. Duensing in Hennecke, Vol. II, p. 642ff. The book is in two parts 1-5 and 6-11. We are only concerned in the thesis with Part I which contains an extraneous section, 3:13 - 5:1 (Christian work). Apart from 1:2b - 5a and the main part of 1:13 the rest of chp. 1 is a later addition. The rest of chps. 1-5 (excluding 3:13 - 5:1) is a Jewish book known before the writing of Heb. 11:37.

<sup>36</sup>See R.M. Grant, The Apostolic Fathers, Vol. I, New York, 1964:p.75 asserts that it is Jewish-Christian in origin and late first cen. A.D. R.A. Kraft, The Apostolic Fathers, Vol. III, New York, 1965, p.76 agrees that a great deal of material comes from late 1st, early 2nd A.D. but says the present form is not earlier than mid-2nd cen.



<sup>37</sup>Cf., Did. 5:2 ῥυθιζήτε, τέκνα ἀπὸ τοῦτων & πάντων with II.3:2 and 12:3 with II.3:10,12.

<sup>38</sup>Grant, op. cit., p.78, dates it some time in the second century. Kraft op. cit., pp. 42f. says somewhere between 70-135 A.D.

<sup>39</sup>Cf. too, Ep. Barn. 18:2 with II.2:6 and 15:5 with II.2:8,12.

<sup>40</sup>E. Klostermann, Kleine Texte, 2nd edn., Bonn, 1908, I.1ff. Probably written in the first half of 2nd cen. perhaps around 135 A.D. in Egypt; so C. Maurer in Hennecke, Vol. II, p.664.

<sup>41</sup>I Clem. 38:4 reads ὁφείλομεν κατὰ πάντα εὐχαριστεῖν. Cf. with II.1:3; 2:13. Polycarp, Ad. Phil. 11:3,4 probably refers to II.1:4 and 3:15:

'among whom the blessed Paul laboured (i.e. the Philippians) who are praised at the beginning of his epistle. For concerning you he boasts in all the churches who alone had known the Lord, for we had not known him yet ... do not regard such men (i.e. backsliders) as enemies.

The epistle is Philipians cf. 1:3ff; II.1:4 is alluded to to comment on the Philippian Christians (Phil. 4:15 is an inadequate text) and II.3:15 is virtually quoted.

<sup>42</sup>This issue prompted A. Harnack to publish his article, 'Das Problem des zweiten Thessalonicherbriefs', in Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Pt. I, Berlin, 1910, pp. 560-578.

<sup>43</sup>Op. cit., p.564, "eine besondere Gruppe innerhalb der Christenheit Thessalonichs", i.e. Jews. He bases this on Acts 17:4 and the use of ἀπαρχήν (B G 33) in II.2:13. For similar views; K. Lake, The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul, London, 1911, pp. 83ff., and R.M. Grant, A Historical Introduction to the New Testament, London, 1963, p. 179.

<sup>44</sup>2nd edn., 1925, pp. 48f.

<sup>45</sup>3rd edn., 1937, pp. 57f. I was sent to the church leaders. I.5:27 might seem to imply a private letter, but such an explanation is unnecessary. If it was private why make it public. Everything in I points to a community letter and 5:27 insists that all the church hear it.

<sup>46</sup>We reject E. Schweizer's attempt to prove II was originally a Philippian letter copied and kept at Thessalonica, 'Der zweite Thessalonicherbrief ein Philipperbrief? Th.Z. 1 (1945) 90-105. This is pure conjecture and ultimately based on a misuse of Polycarp, Ad Phil. 11:3f. see fn.41. This text is referred, by P.V. Benicke in The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers, op. cit., p.95 and Rigaux, pp. 116f., to II.1:4 and 3:15. In spite of the close connection with a Philippian reference the origin of II can not be determined by this very inadequate argument. For further discussion cf. W.R. Schoedel, The Apostolic Fathers, Vol. V, London, 1967, pp. 33f.

<sup>47</sup>A point made by A.L. Moore, I and II Thessalonians (N. Cen. B.), London, 1969, p.15.

<sup>48</sup>Gal.1:9.

<sup>49</sup>Studies in the Gospels and Epistles, Manchester, 1962, pp. 259-278. Originally published in B.J.R.L. 35 (1952/53) 428ff. For the same view, R. Gregson, 'A Solution to the Problems of the Thessalonian Letters', Ev.Q. 38 (1966) 76-80 and R.W. Thurston, 'The relationship between the Thessalonian Epistles', E.T. 85 (1973/74) 52-56.

<sup>50</sup>'Abfassung und ältesten Sammlung der Paulinischen Hauptbriefe' Z.N.W. 51 (1960) 225-245.

<sup>51</sup>Earlier W. Hadorn had placed the letters in this period, 'Die Abfassung des Thessalonicherbriefe in der Zeit der dritten Missionreise des Paulus', B.F.Th. 24 (1919/20) 67ff. and 'Die Abfassung der Thessalonicher briefe auf den dritten Missionreise und der Canon des Marcion', Z.N.W. 19 (1919/20) 67-72.

<sup>52</sup>Zeit und Geschichte, op. cit., pp. 295-315 and Paulus und die Gnostiker (Th.F., 35) Hamburg, 1965, pp. 89-157.

<sup>53</sup>Zeit u. Geschichte, p. 308 = Paulus, pp. 153f.

<sup>54</sup>C.J. Bjerkelund, Parakalô. Form, Funktion und Sinn der parakalô - Sätze in den paulischen Briefen (Bibliotheca Theol. Norvegica 1), Oslo, 1967, pp. 127ff.

<sup>55</sup>G. Ogg, The Chronology of the Life of St. Paul, London, 1968, pp. 126,132, says Paul arrived in Corinth in the early days of January 50 A.D. and set sail for Syria in the autumn of 51 A.D. Between these two dates Paul composed II. Cf. Kümmel, op. cit., pp. 179-181. J. Knox, Chapters in a Life of Paul, New York, 1950, pp. 30ff., 61ff., virtually dismisses Acts as a basis for the chronology of Paul's letters supposing that the latter furnish a sound basis, e.g. Gal. 1:18,

21, Rom. 12:25. In his opinion we should date I not long after 40 A.D., (II also, if genuine). T.H. Campbell, 'Paul's "Missionary Journeys" as reflected in his letters', J.B.L. 74 (1955) 80-87 has to all intents and purposes demonstrated the basic harmony of the Lukan and Pauline material.

<sup>56</sup> Many MSS refer to Athens as the place of writing and append this as a note to I.5:28 (ἐγράφη ἀπὸ Ἀθηνῶν, A K L). Against this stands I.3:1 which would be expressed differently. Acts 18:5 says Timothy rejoined Paul at Corinth which can suit I.3:1ff. However the movements of Paul, Silas and Timothy are not at all clear.

<sup>57</sup> See chp. 4, fn. 43.

<sup>58</sup> Marxsen, op. cit., p. 44 considers II was produced soon after 70 A.D. and written to combat Gnosticism. This is more reasonable than Schmithals' theory but he still has the problem of finding 'Gnosticism' in Thessalonica at that time. Cf. too W. Harnisch, Eschatologische Existenz, Ein exegetischer Beitrag zum Sachanliegen von I. Thessalonicher 4:13 - 5:11 (F.R.L.A.N.T., 110), Göttingen, 1973; contends that Paul is dealing with Gnostics, pp. 77-83.

<sup>59</sup> The debate on pre-Christian Gnosticism and Gnosticism within the N.T. and N.T. period continues. R. McL. Wilson's judicious words upon the subject are worth quoting. "We can indeed speak of an incipient Gnosticism in the N.T. period but how much of the later developed Gnosticism was already present at any given stage is still obscure". He argues that nothing in Thessalonians or for that matter Philippians demands a Gnostic explanation. See Gnosis and the New Testament Oxford, 1968, pp. 30 and 58ff.; Also his earlier book The Gnostic Problem London, 1958 and the chapter on 'Gnosticism in the N.T. Times', pp. 64ff.

<sup>60</sup> So Oepke, p. 129 and W. de Boor, Die Briefe des Paulus an die Thessalonicher erklärt, Wuppertal, 1960, p. 20; but both after hesitation.

## CHAPTER TWO

### THE ESCHATOLOGY OF I AND II THESSALONIANS

In order to appreciate the setting of II.2:1-12, we must consider the important place eschatology has in the two epistles. At a glance it is clear it plays a major role, which indicates, on our dating, that this type of material was already accepted as a fundamental part of mission preaching and Christian belief, only twenty years after Christ's death<sup>1</sup>.

#### I THESSALONIANS

After a thanksgiving in I.1:2ff., Paul goes on to recall his mission work at Thessalonica and its attendant success. He notes with pleasure, that the work is continuing, because the original groundwork was deep and lasting. They had turned, ἐκείστροψατε, from their idols to serve the living and true God, 1:9. The message, which had been given to them, was not merely of redemption in this life, but of full salvation in the future. The hope which they possessed placed them in a position of waiting for the appearance from heaven of God's son, Jesus, 1:10.

The way in which these ideas are expressed in 1:9f. has led to the interesting suggestion that these two verses contain two strophes of three lines each<sup>2</sup>.



- A. Ἐπεστρέψατε πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων  
 Δουλεύειν Θεῷ ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινῷ  
 καὶ ἀναμένειν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν.
- B. Ὃν ἡγείρεν ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν  
 Ἰησοῦν τὸν ῥυόμενον ἡμᾶς  
 Ἐκ τῆς ὀργῆς τῆς ἐρχομένης.

The first line of each can be seen to point to the past, the second to the present and the third to the future. Whether we have a hymn is not an important concern for us. Our interest lies with the words in the statement of faith and the redemptive eschatology it displays.

a) The words used in this 'missionary' statement are rather unexpected, that is to say, there is nothing typically Pauline about them. Turned, (in effect, converted, ἐπιστρέφω ), is used by Paul in II Cor. 3:16, (an O.T. citation), and Gal. 4:9. In the latter instance it can hardly mean "Converted", as it does in I.1:9 and frequently in Acts, 3:19; 9:35 etc. The application of real, (ἀληθινός), and living, (ζῶν), to God, must be traced back to the O.T., cf. Ex. 34:6; Num. 14:21; the latter word <sup>is</sup> only found here in Paul in relation to God. Moreover instead of reading, 'they<sup>you</sup> had turned to God', we might have expected the word 'Jesus' or 'Lord', cf. Rom. 6:16ff. There is also the unusual Greek word for wait, (ἀναμένω). Elsewhere Paul uses a compound of δέχεσθαι. Finally, we have the unique Pauline eschatological reference in the verb, deliver, (ῥύομαι)<sup>3</sup>.

b) The cross, defined as "for us", appears in other places in the Pauline writings, Rom. 5:6,8; I Cor. 1:13; 8:11; II Cor. 5:14; Gal. 2:20, but with an application to the present time and past sins. Here however, the redemption is eschatological.

On the basis of these striking features, Dibelius<sup>4</sup> suggested that I.1:9f. was typical of the Pauline message and that the Apostle had used words which were common to a missionary's vocabulary. We must recognise that a group of people in the same profession or occupation would today use a specialised vocabulary, but if in this case Paul is drawing upon a common-word fund, why does he not use these words elsewhere and/or with similar nuances? It seems a real possibility that we have here a pre-Pauline formula which sets out to show in theological terms what missionary work achieves and brings. An absence of any reference to the cross strengthens this possibility, for we must surely believe that if Paul composed these verses himself, he would have brought in some direct reference to it, i.e. in association with the resurrection<sup>5</sup>. On the other hand, Paul could hardly have used a formula which excluded the cross, which he regarded as central to his theology and preaching, Gal. 1:4; I Cor. 1:23. No doubt mention of eschatological salvation implied the cross in the Apostle's mind.

The way this (confessional?) assertion of faith is expressed strongly suggests that it was intended by (Hellenistic?)<sup>6</sup> Jewish Christians for the Gentiles. Various things seem to indicate this. The name Jesus is

used by itself (cf. its Jewish setting in Mt. 1:21), idols are contrasted with the living and real God (typical O.T. thinking), and there is the possibility of a pun, assuming an Aramaic or Hebrew Vorlage, on the name Jesus and the verb deliver. These points would suggest characteristic Jewish traits and hence Jewish origin<sup>7</sup>.

If these arguments are correct, it is evident that Paul is not to be regarded as the creator or even principal exponent of the Parousia idea. Parousia may be a Pauline word, but the concept will belong to the belief of the church before Thessalonians was written. That Jesus was to appear "from heaven" was an expectation eagerly awaited. Perhaps this arose from such simple assertions as, 'Jesus is coming', 'Jesus is coming from heaven' or 'Jesus will appear'<sup>8</sup>. From these affirmations would arise the eager expectation of the eschatological Saviour, cf. I.1:10. It would appear to us that Paul has incorporated a formula in I and lent personal authority to it by the mere fact of re-iteration.

This understanding of I.1:9f. may help to explain the use of the first person singular in II.2:5<sup>9</sup>. All scholars have noted Paul's desire to stress his own personal involvement and interest at this juncture in II. He had often told<sup>10</sup> them himself about these things, i.e. verses 3 and 4 particularly, but probably v.6ff. as well. Yet we are left wondering if that is the only reason. Why could he not have associated his co-workers in this mild rebuke? Why did he need to emphasize his own activity? It cannot be that he alone gave the teaching, since I.3:2 shows that he had confidence in the ability

of Timothy to establish the young community in its faith. I.1:9a suggests that I.1:9b,10 was used by Paul, Silvanus and Timothy so it is unlikely that Paul gives apostolic authority to II.2:3ff. apart from these two who were themselves termed apostles, I.2:6. We may suggest rather, that Paul wanted to lend his personal authority (II.3:17) and touch to the eschatological traditions which he had handed on to them. In other words reference to the Apostasy, the Anomos and the Katechon were part of the apocalyptic tradition passed on to them at the mission time, and could not be discarded, misinterpreted or forgotten at will. He is saying 'I, Paul, told you often, do you not recall this?'

Since Paul is the sole author of I Corinthians, we cannot find a similar change of person in that letter. We can, though, see the same attitude reflected in chapter 15, in connection with the handing on of earlier tradition<sup>11</sup>. The build up of first person singular verbs is very impressive; γνωρίζω, εὐηγγελισάμην (bis), παρέδωκα, παρέλαβον, 15:1-3. Paul's indebtedness to tradition is not to be under-estimated<sup>12</sup>.

Another indication of his use of tradition is found in I.2:15f. Chapter 2:1-16 continues the thought of the original mission work. It culminates in a reminder that present sufferings at the hands of fellow-countrymen are paralleled by the Jewish persecution of Judean churches. This leads to a violent accusation of the Jews, who are only completing their history of guilt, and in consequence are lying even now under the wrath of God. This is in

very sharp contrast to 2:13f. Why Paul chose to use such forceful language at this point, remains unclear. What does become clear from a study of the passage is that we have once more hints of pre-Pauline tradition in 2:15,16. The use of words in these two verses suggests this opinion. Instead of the expected verb for the death of Jesus, *σταυρόω* we have *ἀποκτείνω*<sup>13</sup>. Only in Acts 3:15 is this word used again in connection with Christ's death. It could be that Paul chose it as the most appropriate word for this context in which it becomes virtually equivalent to 'murder'. On the other hand Paul could have received it from earlier tradition and belief, which had, by the use of *ἀποκτείνω*, interpreted the action of the Jews against Jesus - perhaps for apologetic reasons.

Then we have *ἐκδιώκω*, hapax legomenon, although two codices D and A have it in Lk.11:49. Whether we translate it (from the context) "drove out", or "persecuted", it is a strong word for Paul to use and shows how intensely he felt about Jewish opposition towards his missionary work. Could it not indicate also that others shared his feelings? However, it is not the only word used once by Paul in these verses. Opposed, *ἐναντίας* appears nowhere else<sup>14</sup>. Finally, we should note that some Greek MSS. of the Testament of Levi parallel v.16c<sup>15</sup>. This has led to the suggestion that v.16c is a post-Pauline addition<sup>16</sup>. Such an explanation is not necessarily required. It is quite possible to envisage both sources using common apocalyptic material<sup>17</sup>. V.16c has an integral link with v.15 and v.16a,b, which certainly suggests an

original unity. So as vv.15,16 are not typically Pauline, they can be regarded as pre-Pauline tradition.

In view of these unusual features and the similarity with Mt. 23:29-38, it has been proposed that Paul is using material from earlier tradition<sup>18</sup>. This does not mean literary dependency but a borrowing from common oral sources. The similarities between I.2:15f. and Mt. 23:29ff. are quite striking. Similar ideas relate to the prophets having been killed, persecution, completing the guilt of the Jewish sins and future condemnation. In both places, similar words are used, ἀποκτείνω, προφῆτης, (ἐκ-)διώκω, (ἀνα-)πληρόω. Moreover, in spite of Rigaux's denial<sup>19</sup>, both passages have eschatological overtones. True, Matthew may aim a series of Woes against the Pharisees, but v.36 seems to point to an apocalyptic judgment. The purpose and setting of the pericope in Matthew are due to the Evangelist, but this does not hide earlier material which has been used and developed by Paul in I.2:15,16.

In conclusion we can make four points.

1. Behind the violent accusation of I.2:15,16 lies earlier tradition.
2. This tradition is reflected in material contained in Matthew's gospel but used differently.
3. The early church, perhaps for apologetic reasons, passed judgment on the Jews and found them guilty of the crucifixion, cf. Acts 2:23.
4. An apocalyptic judgment was the inevitable conclusion to such Jewish attitudes and practices. Matthew



sees this fulfilled in the Fall of Jerusalem, A.D. 70<sup>20</sup>, whilst Paul leaves it undetermined<sup>21</sup>.

The roots of Pauline eschatology once again reach back into an earlier part of the church's life<sup>22</sup>.

From 2:17 - 3:13, Paul explains how much he has missed seeing the new converts and outlines the lengths to which he has been to find out about the situation he had so hurriedly left behind<sup>23</sup>. Timothy's good news of continued faith has reassured him and so he can conclude this section with a prayer that he may be able to visit them soon. Meantime they must stand firm in their faith, ready for the coming of Jesus with his saints, 3:13. In chapter 4, the Apostle reaffirms the mode of conduct that is becoming to the Christian. We can probably detect in this passage a hint of the sexual and ethical problems which were facing the young community. New moral standards brought moral problems. Paul then makes an appeal for mutual love towards each other, (is there a suggestion that the community was still a group of individuals, or that the tendency to individualism was very <sup>strong</sup> real?), and an effort to demonstrate this and the respectability of Christianity to the outside pagan community.

In a rather abrupt manner Paul alters his thought. An eschatological problem had arisen which demanded an immediate answer. Certain members of the community were worried about the state of the dead in Christ. This was pressing, in view of the near arrival of the Parousia. The basic problem does not concern the non-arrival of the Parousia and the death of Christians<sup>24</sup>; nothing in 4:13ff.

warrants this explanation. Rather, some have died, (although this is not explicitly stated), and relatives and friends are worried about the status of their dead kinsmen and friends. It seems that anxiety over this question was serious, because Paul writes that they were sorrowing just as if they had no hope, v.13<sup>25</sup>. The problem does not concern the fact of the resurrection. Paul would surely have discussed it in detail, if that were the basic concern, cf. I Cor.15. The problem is high-lighted in the words of v.15, ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες οἱ περιλειπόμενοι εἰς τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ κυρίου οὐ μὴ φθάσωμεν τοὺς κοιμηθέντας. It appears that some considered that the dead would not share in the joy of the Parousia<sup>26</sup>. Paul counters this by saying that the dead will not be at a disadvantage; on the contrary, they rise first, to meet their Lord.

All of this Paul declares by "a word of the Lord", ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου . Two questions immediately confront us:

- (a) What is the extent of the word?
- (b) What does the expression mean?

Question (a) need not detain us long since whether the word relates to 15b or beyond will not affect our thesis. Suffice it to say, that v.15b contains in brief what is expanded by various images in v.16f<sup>27</sup>. This makes it very difficult to recover the exact words of the logion. There are three elements in v.15b.

- i) The coming of the Lord
- ii) The premier position of the dead
- iii) The subsequent position of those who are alive at the Parousia.



With apocalyptic imagery i) is described in detail in v.16; ii) is briefly mentioned at the end of that verse, "and the dead in Christ shall rise first"; iii) is referred to in v.17<sub>a</sub>, with 17<sub>b</sub> relating to ii) and iii), "to meet the Lord in the air".

The basic content of the logion is clear, but what does "the word of the Lord" mean? A number of answers have been given.

1. Paul is quoting from or alluding to a saying or thought in the Gospels.  
Mk. 9:1 and Mt. 22:32 have been suggested as sources, or, and more likely, Mt. 24:30 and Jn. 6:39f.<sup>28</sup>. However, none of these really relates to the problem troubling the Thessalonians. Unless we argue that Paul modified the texts considerably, we can dismiss this view.<sup>29</sup> A variant of this view, but equally inappropriate is the idea that Paul is summing up the teaching of Jesus<sup>30</sup>.
2. Paul is basing what he says upon an agraphon, cf. Acts 20:35<sup>31</sup>. This will always remain a possibility since we have no way of proving or disproving such a claim and we must suppose that many agrapha, (irrespective of authenticity), circulated in the early churches. It is certainly possible to see v.15<sub>b</sub> as a statement of Jesus in some such form as, "Those who remain

alive at the Coming of the Son of Man, (altered by Paul to his then favourite expression "Parousia of the Lord"), will not precede those who have tasted death." The terms and expressions of v.16f. preclude, it would seem, that they were part of the authentic logion.

3. Paul believes that what he says is in accordance with the mind of the risen Christ<sup>32</sup>. We have an illustration of this in I Cor. 2:16 and 7:10,12. In the latter case, Paul distinguishes between his own word and that of the Lord, cf. too vv.25,40. We must notice however that Paul does not explicitly say that he has the mind of Christ, i.e. that by living so close to his Lord he can pass on what he believes Christ would say or have him say. V.10 implies this, yet at the same time infers a specific charge or command from the Lord. In Corinthians he is dealing with ethical problems, whereas in Thessalonians he is encountering a theological problem. However this idea, of Paul's living contact with Christ enabling him to speak a "word from the Lord", could be linked to either the first or second views. The strongest argument against this suggestion is that Paul would have made clear that he had no specific word, as he did in Corinthians. Indeed the

way Paul expresses himself in I.4:15 suggests he is thinking of a definite word.

4. Paul is using a prophetic word<sup>33</sup>. Prophecy was well-known in the early church. In Acts prophets are frequently mentioned, 11:27ff; 13:1; 15:32; 21:9ff. In I Cor. 14 rules are laid down to govern its function within the community. It was certainly rated very highly by Paul, since unlike tongues, it was extremely profitable and edifying, I Cor. 14:3,31. It is clear that it is not to be equated with preaching but is the utterance of a specific revelation, 14:26. This revelation could be in the form of fore-telling, Acts 11:27ff. or relating apocalyptic truth, Rev. 1:3; 22:7. The roots <sup>of</sup>for this N.T. phenomenon must be located in O.T. prophecy, where the word of the Lord was spoken through God's servants, Ezek. 34:1; Amos 5:1. The phrase, "in a word of the Lord", expresses the revelatory message, II Chron. 30:12; cf. Ecclus 48:3. If the word was prophetic, was its author Paul<sup>34</sup> or someone else? If it was Paul we would have expected him to have used the first person singular, cf. II.2:5; 3:17 so perhaps we should look for some nameless prophet. Whatever be the truth about the origin of the logion we can be sure that to Paul it was

a revelation from the Lord. The authority for what he has to say was from Christ.

5. It is possible that Paul is quoting from or alluding to some apocalyptic source<sup>35</sup>. If a Jewish source we must presume that any statement has been translated into Christian terms. As we have no knowledge of any such work though we are left to useless speculation.

The most likely origins of the logion are those suggested in 1. and 4. It is conceivable that Paul considers that what is said in v.15 is based on what Christ actually said as reported to him. Alternatively the logion's source could be a prophecy but recently Hill has quite rightly queried the creative role ascribed to the prophet in the early church<sup>36</sup>. What does emerge from this discussion is that whether the logion is a prophecy or linked to an earthly word of Jesus in some way<sup>37</sup>, we do have an indication of pre-Pauline material, since we think it unlikely that Paul is using his own word or prophecy.

As "a word of (from) the Lord" Paul uses it to comfort and calm fears which had arisen in the community. The apocalyptic imagery of v.16f, (if part of the logion, this must indicate a Jewish-Christian background), heightens the expectation of the Parousia. Coming, descent, trumpet, gathering of the elect, archangel and the meeting in the air encourage a very literal hope. More important than the details, however, is the underlying belief (which has come

via the church) of the death, resurrection and coming of the Lord who will raise the dead and living to meet him in the air. Such hope and faith has gone a long way beyond the Jewish idea of the visitation of God at the End, to centre in the personal coming of Messiah who will bring the dead to life and unite them to himself, together with the transformed living. After this event, they would be forever with their Lord. Such was the comfort Paul gave the community.

Paul has not yet finished with eschatology. He now broadens his perspective to relate 'the Day of the Lord' (I.5:2) to daily living (I.5:1-11)<sup>38</sup>. We have already mentioned that Paul is not saying here, "the Day can come at any moment"<sup>39</sup>. He is insisting that believers ought to be so alive to the possibility of its coming that they read "the times and seasons" (5:1)<sup>40</sup> about which they had been instructed earlier. To the "sons of darkness"<sup>41</sup>, the Day will be unexpected and come as a "thief in the night" (5:4). Yet the possibility remains that some of the "sons of light" will also be unaware of and unprepared for the Coming Day. Against this danger Paul urges them to be disciplined and equipped with spiritually-protective armour (5:8)<sup>42</sup>.

The use of the thief imagery allows us to draw aside once again the curtain of Pauline thought and find a link with earlier tradition<sup>43</sup>. This particular imagery has had its impact on the church at all stages of its early existence. It is taken up again in II Pet. 3:10 and Rev. 3:3; 16:15<sup>44</sup>, and employed by two of the 4 Evangelists

Mt. 24:42-51; cf. 25:1-13; Lk. 12:35-38, 39f.; 13:33-36. Jeremias<sup>45</sup> considers the simile to be an authentic logion of Jesus, appearing in the Gospels with a changed application. Originally it was directed to the hearers of Jesus to warn them of a coming eschatological catastrophe. Later the church applied it to its members, cf. Lk. 12:22; Mt. 24:3, even if in every passage it has retained its relevance to the unbeliever and unrepentant. Bultmann<sup>46</sup> takes the opposite view and believes the parable to be a creation of the church in which the delay of the Parousia is presupposed.

We need not determine the origin or Sitz im Leben of the imagery. From its use we can deduce that it was a well-known Parousia metaphor which has been adapted for use by Paul (and other writers)<sup>47</sup> presumably from an oral rather than a written source in Paul's case. If so we can observe here one more instance in I of pre-Pauline tradition fashioning the eschatological thought of the Apostle and being used by him<sup>48</sup>.

The final section, I.5:12ff., consists of a series of exhortations<sup>49</sup>. Our attention is drawn particularly to the nature of these instructions. They are nearly all designed to promote unity and understanding amongst church members. Is there any reason for this? There must have been a very <sup>strong</sup> ~~real~~ tendency for many of the new converts to be highly individualistic in outlook and pay scant attention to church authority, 5:12, fall out with other members, 5:13, and perpetuate wrongs, 5:15. On a more theological level there would be those who advocated certain attitudes to Christian experience; for example, despise prophecies,



5:20. The need for teaching on unity is understandable if we keep in mind that here is a young Christian community trying to adjust to new ethical standards and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. It is against this background that we must see the problem of the group who were saying 'the Day of the Lord has come', II.2:lff.

The epistle ends with a final salutation, in which Paul puts them on oath to read the letter to all.

From this brief analysis of eschatology in I we can reach the following conclusions.

1. Eschatology is one of the main concerns in the epistle. Understanding it, or applying it, caused difficulties to new converts. Unused to O.T. prophecy and Jewish apocalyptic ideas they had questions arising from trying to reconcile their previous way of thinking and acting with that preached by Paul. We may suggest that the situation shown by I parallels that of other newly-established churches.
2. Evidence has been produced to show that Pauline eschatology is not a creation of the man himself, but is derived from earlier belief. No doubt Paul developed ideas from church tradition as he did ideas from the O.T. (cf. on the Anomos).

3. Eschatology brought a vivid expectation of the coming of Jesus, 1:9f.; 4:13ff. At the same time, Paul tempered it with a more sober expectation of precursors leading up to that event, 5:1ff.
4. Whilst Paul borrowed and adapted O.T. and Jewish apocalyptic traits to describe the Parousia expectation, we must not lose sight of the original features of the Thessalonian eschatology. The community were encouraged to look for a personal Saviour, who would descend from heaven and attract his people to him. The keynote of hope is not some renewed or idealised Jerusalem but to be "for ever with the Lord".

Eschatology mattered to Paul and the young community. How else can we explain the space given to it in Thessalonian and Corinthian letters? Therefore we need not wonder that a second letter followed so closely on a first dealing with the same important area of Christian belief.

## II THESSALONIANS

After an introduction, the Apostle offers a thanksgiving to God for the community. They were loyal to their faith, in spite of present persecution. This was only testing their worthiness for the kingdom of God, which, in due time, would bring about their vindication. They



will inherit glory and distinction, whilst those who disobey God will be cut off from his presence. Using a mosaic of O.T. texts, he describes vividly the certain ruin of the wicked, 1:8f.<sup>50</sup>, but prays that the called of God may show their faith to the glory of Jesus Christ, 1:11f. The points to notice here are:

1. The violent way that Paul outlines the doom awaiting those who do not know God or obey the gospel, 1:8<sup>51</sup>. We should compare this with, I.2:15f.
2. The apocalyptic imagery, such as we find in I.4:13ff.
3. The use of eschatology to bring strength to the troubled community, 1:11f., cf. I.4:18.

Paul now passes on to the main point of the letter. He has found that the present situation in Thessalonica, in so far as he knows what is happening in the community, merits more eschatological instruction. He sets out, therefore to recall certain parts of his teaching related during his first visit, 2:5. His pre-occupation with End-time signs is not to recall them for their own sake but to prove that the view held by some in the church is wrong. He writes asking them to do justice to and safeguard, ὁ κέρ <sup>52</sup>, the Parousia and eschatological gathering to the Lord. If they do not he is afraid that they will be

shaken from their mind ( $\nu\omicron\omicron\acute{\sigma}$  = from a true understanding)<sup>53</sup> and troubled. This might come about in three ways and they are specified as  $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\rho\alpha$ ,  $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$  and  $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\acute{\eta}$  "as if from us", 2:2<sup>54</sup>. Lest the believers were being shaken in ways other than those he specifies Paul also urges them to be deceived by no one in any~~way~~<sup>55</sup>, 2:3a.

The problem is mentioned in an all too brief and enigmatic phrase; "The Day of the Lord has come" ( $\epsilon\nu\epsilon\acute{\sigma}\tau\eta\kappa\epsilon\nu$ )<sup>55</sup>. Does this mean that the 'Day' is here but not the Parousia, or that the Day is imminent? This thesis will suggest that neither of these views is true. In some sense 'the Day' was thought by certain believers to be actually present: it really had come. This does not deny <sup>their</sup> belief in a future hope and the Parousia in particular. If they had denied the latter it is likely Paul would have written in a different way and using stronger language, since belief in the Parousia was an important item of Christian faith. However if the "Day of the Lord" was treated in a non-Pauline way, there was a danger that the idea of the Parousia might be eroded. So Paul sets out to show that the Day is a future Day which must be preceded by events and signs, which are yet to occur.

Paul does not answer the problem by a frontal attack or in some philosophical way. He does not use O.T. proof texts. We have already argued that for pagan converts such references would have little relevance<sup>56</sup>. In typical Pauline fashion he refers to points of doctrine which he had already taught them. He asserts rather than argues, which is precisely what we find in I Cor. 15:12,20. There are two signs which he mentions; The Apostasy and The Man of

Lawlessness<sup>57</sup>. No doubt he would have mentioned other general signs of the End, earthquakes, famines, and false prophets if it would have helped his case, but the two he chose in particular are inter-related and occur directly before the End, the Parousia. So the community are instructed to look for the two signs since when they occur Christ will come, destroy apostates and the Anomos and bring about final salvation. For this they, the Thessalonian believers, were elected, 2:13.

At the moment though the Katechon is present<sup>58</sup> and the "mystery of lawlessness is at work". They are experiencing<sup>59</sup> (or aware of) the Katechon, v.6 and Katechōn v.7. The time will come when the Katechōn will withdraw (ἐκ πέρας γένηται)<sup>60</sup> and the Anomos will be revealed to carry out his Satanic-inspired activity. He is anti-God 2:4 and anti-God's Messiah 2:8. He is possessed by Satan and works by the latter's power and authority, 2:9, but his sphere is limited to those who reject the Gospel and disobey the Truth.

This thesis will attempt to show that the figure of the Anomos (Antichrist) is in certain respects unlike any other in Biblical or non-Biblical texts. Human precursors and traits of Belial lie behind the figure, as do texts speaking of Satanic possession, but in the end we are forced to conclude that belief in an End-time opponent of God has arisen within either the belief of the church or Pauline thought.

Apart from Revelation, this passage proves to be one of the most difficult eschatological sections in the whole of the N.T.

In 2:15ff. Paul reminds believers that they must hold on to the traditions, which had been taught earlier by the missionaries. These were the very essence of Christian hope, 2:1<sup>6</sup>7. The way he addresses himself here, shows that he did not treat the community or part of it, as Gnostic heretics. No 'Galatian tone' is adopted (cf. Gal. 1:9) for these people are still in the mainstream of Christian belief.

Then Paul passes quite naturally into a request that the church pray for him in his work, 3:1ff. He expresses confidence in them as a group of believers, but points out that laziness can hinder the church's welfare. Paul had given them an example to follow and idle busy-bodies must follow it, 3:6-12. 'Family' advice is offered and finally he concludes with a signature which authenticates the letter 3:17, and of course, The Grace, 3:18, cf. Rom. 16:20; I Cor. 16:23; I.5:28.

<sup>1</sup>On eschatology and ethics see B.N. Kaye, 'Eschatology and Ethics in I and II Thessalonians', N.T. 17 (1975) 47-57. Whilst we agree that the evidence about the disorder in the church (II.3:6-13) does not permit us to relate it to a false or one-sided new eschatology, it is doubtful if eschatology does not have some implications which might lead to a loss of moral earnestness, cf. the implications of  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$  which could lead to antinomianism, Rom. 6:1ff.

<sup>2</sup>G. Friedrich, 'Ein Tauflied hellenistischer Judenchristen, I Thess. 1:9f.', Th.Z. 21 (1965) 502-516. Cf. too P. Stuhlmacher, Das paulinische Evangelium, I. Vorgeschichte (F.R.L.A.N.T., 95), Göttingen, 1968, pp. 258-266 and Best, pp. 85ff.

<sup>3</sup>To refer to eschatological salvation Paul uses  $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\omega$ , I Cor. 3:15; 5:5; Rom. 5:9 and  $\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$  Rom. 13:11; Phil. 1:28; I.5:8f.; II.2:13. W. Foerster, ' $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\omega$ ' in T.D.N.T., VII, pp. 965-1003: 992 says is above all for Paul a future eschatological term. W. Kasch, ' $\sigma\acute{\omega}\sigma\alpha\iota$ ' in T.D.N.T., VI, pp. 998-1003: 1003 refers to the following texts with this Greek verb in an eschatological context; Rom. 11:26; cf. Col. 1:13; II Tim. 4:18 but none of these deals with deliverance from future wrath.

<sup>4</sup>Ad loc.

<sup>5</sup>J. Munck, 'I Thess. 1:9-10 and the Missionary Preaching of Paul', N.T.S. 9 (1962/63) 95-110, denies the presence of a missionary formula. His criticism lingers on the absence of any reference to the Cross, which he regards as an essential ingredient of early preaching.

<sup>6</sup>C. Bussmann, Themen der paulinischen Missionspredigt auf dem Hintergrund der spätjüdisch-hellenistischen Missionsliteratur (Europäische Hochschulschriften Reihe 23, vol. 3), Bern-Frankfurt, 1971, pp. 39ff.

<sup>7</sup>The use of the plural  $\tau\omega\nu\ \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\rho\alpha\upsilon\omega\nu$  does not necessarily indicate a Semitism. Paul uses the singular ten times and the plural eleven, see Moore, ad loc., although in this context it is probably a confirmation of the view suggested.

<sup>8</sup>Cf. I Cor. 16:22  $\kappa\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \&\ \theta\alpha$  (has come) or  $\kappa\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \theta\alpha$  (Our Lord come) with C.K. Barratt, The First Epistle to the Corinthians (Bl. N.T.C.), London, 1968, ad loc.) H. Conzelmann, Der erste Brief an die Korinther (Meyer, 11th edn.), Göttingen, 1969, ad loc. points out that linguistically it is impossible to decide for a perfect or imperative. If perfect it can only be read as 'Our Lord' has (is)come', cf. Did. 10:6 where it must be imperative from the context. If it is an assertion in I Cor., it still sheds light on the kind of simple expression of faith made by the early church.



<sup>9</sup>On the question 'I' and 'we' see E.H. Askwith, ' "I" and "We" in the Thessalonian Epistles', Exp. VIII, 1, 149-159, Best, pp. 26ff., Bl-Deb. para. 280, K. Dick, Der Schriftstellerische Plural bei Paulus, Halle, 1890, von Dobschütz, pp. 67f., J.A. Eschlimann, 'La Redaction des Epîtres Pauliniennes', R.B. 53(1946), 185-195, W.F. Lofthouse, 'Singular and Plural in St. Paul's Epistles', E.T. 58 (1946/47) 179-182; idem ' "I" and "We" in the Pauline Letters', E.T. 64, (1952/53), 241-245, E. Mayser, Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit, II, 1, Berlin, 1926, pp. 40ff., Moule, pp. 118f., Moulton-Turner, p. 28, Rigaux, pp. 77-80. If we take into account comments of scholars on the other Epistles of Paul the literature is vast. We shall limit ourselves to I and II since in our opinion it is impossible to find a consistent practice in Paul, (cf. Dick, op. cit. who affirms this). Apart from which other letters are later than II and may reflect a greater consistency since Paul uses the singular fairly regularly (I Cor. Phil. Rom. Phlm. cf. Askwith, ibid, pp. 150-153). Cf. E. Stauffer, 'ἐγώ' in T.D.N.T., II, pp. 354-362.

We ignore the use of 'We' (or 'Our') which plainly includes the readers in what is stated, I.1:3; 4:15; 5:6; II.2:1,16. The rest of the references can be taken in the following ways:

#### (1) Epistolary Plural

Since the singular is used in five places (I.2:18; 3:5; 5:27; II.2:5; 3:17) this suggestion is unlikely. We would not have expected someone using an epistolary we (=I) to drop into the singular. This plural is not frequent in papyri letters although it is well-established in later Greek (Moule, p. 118).

#### (2) Real Plural

Most scholars take Paul's use of the plural to indicate that he associated (pluralis sociativus) Silvanus and Timothy with the writing of the letter. Precisely what the association was we are left to conjecture, but probably Paul felt that the sentiments he expressed were those shared by the other two. In addition to which he wanted his readers to understand that all three missionaries shared together in the responsibility of the church's well-being and growth. I.3:1 is alleged to create difficulties (cf. von Dobschütz, p. 68) but it can refer to Silvanus and Paul without difficulty. In our opinion, although I.2:1-13, 17; 3:5 suggest the author speaks for himself they can still be referred to both Silvanus and Timothy. A pluralis sociativus will not necessarily exclude the personal feelings of the actual writer coming to the fore. As far as possible then a real plurality is conveyed in the Epistles. At the same time we must beware of treating the plural as a pluralis modestiae, which could suggest that Paul is hiding behind two other people and in effect writing what he wants to say through their names. The 'modesty' (if present in the 'we') lies in his willingness to associate what he says with his co-workers.

In view of what we have argued the 'I' must be set over against the Plural and suggest that when it is used in the letters Paul wanted to remind his readers of his own personal interest (I.3:5). In three instances it appears to convey a note of authority as well (I.5:27; II.2:5; 3:17).

<sup>10</sup>See chp. 1, fn. 14.

<sup>11</sup>Conzelmann, op. cit., 'Exkurs: Die Christusformel: I Kor. 15:3-5,' pp. 296-300. He concludes that the formula originated from an earlier time because it was guaranteed by witnesses, not the church. J. H. Schütz, Paul and the Anatomy of Apostolic Authority (S.N.T.S., 26), Cambridge, 1975, pp. 84-113 tends to reject this view. An apostle is not a guarantor of the tradition, p.112.

<sup>12</sup>E.g. in I.4:15, 'word of the Lord'; 5:1ff. the thief simile.

<sup>13</sup>Cf. Rom. 11:3 where it is used in relation to prophets in a quotation from III Kgdms 19:10,14. The use of the word in I may have been influenced by the LXX rendering.

<sup>14</sup>Cf. Acts 26:9; 28:17.

<sup>15</sup>T.Lev. 6:11 "Εφθασε δὲ ἡ ὄργη κυρίου ἐπ' αὐτοὺς εἰς τέλος.

<sup>16</sup>J. Moffat, Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, Edinburgh, 1927, pp. 72f. B.A. Pearson, 'I Th. 2:13-16: A Deutero-Pauline Interpolation', H.Th.R. 64 (1971) 79-94, takes ἐφθασε to refer to<sup>me</sup> destruction of Jerusalem and believes 2:17 follows on 2:12 more naturally.

<sup>17</sup>Fragments of T.Lev. have been found at Qumran in Caves 1 and 4. See D. Barthélemy and J.T. Milik, Discoveries in the Judean Desert, I, Qumran Cave I, Oxford, 1955 and J.T. Milik, 'Le Testament de Lévi en araméen, fragment de la grotte 4 de Qumran', R.B. 62 (1955) 398-406. Other Aramaic fragments have been found, see A.-M. Denis, Introduction aux Pseudépigraphes Grecs d'Ancien Testament, Leiden, 1970, pp. 52f. D.S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, London, 1964, pp. 55ff. considers T.Lev. to be the oldest section or nucleus of the work.

<sup>18</sup>R. Schippers, 'The Pre-Synoptic Tradition in 1 Thessalonians 2:13-16', N.T. 8 (1966) 223-234. For the specific link with Matthew (regarded as pre-Thessalonian) see J.B. Orchard, 'Thessalonians and the Synoptic Gospels', Bib. 19 (1938) 19-42 and E. Cothenet, 'La Deuxieme Épître aux Thessaloniens et l'Apocalypse synoptique', R.de S.R. 42 (1954), 5-39.

<sup>19</sup>Pp. 445f.

<sup>20</sup>The woes of Mt. 23:29ff. are intimately connected by the writer with vv.37ff., so that the latter interprets the former. In Luke the two are separated 11:47-51 and 13:34,35, but in Matthew the two are brought together to show that Jerusalem must be punished because the city represents the sins of the present generation.

<sup>21</sup>As in Matthew, so in I., the Jews are pictured as completing a certain measure of sins, which when full will bring inevitable divine judgment. This may be regarded as already in action, but has not quite reached its end or else be suspended at present. A.T. Hanson, The Wrath of the Lamb, London, 1957, pp. 69ff. refers it to the spiritual state of Jews lying under spiritual condemnation.

<sup>22</sup>Best, pp. 122f.

<sup>23</sup>See R.W. Funk, 'The Apostolic Parousia: Form and Significance' in Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox (ed. W.R. Farmer, C.F.D. Moule, R.R. Niebuhr), Cambridge, 1967, pp. 249-268. He isolates passages (e.g. Phil. 2:19-24; I Cor. 16:1-11) in which he considers Paul has demonstrated his apostolic parousia (= presence: his italics) through three elements

- (a) a letter in lieu of his actual presence
- (b) an emissary as his representative
- (c) a hope of an impending visit.

He thinks that all three are brought together regularly by Paul in a 'discrete section' of which I.2:17-3:13 is an example. Whether Paul deliberately used a particular form to convey his parousia is arguable. Funk finds difficulty in locating all three elements in the 12 passages he lists.

<sup>24</sup>Against W. Neil, Thessalonians (Moffat N.T. Comm.), London, 1950, p.90, who believes the missionaries had left without saying anything about the dead who die prior to the Parousia: the latter being expected at any moment. Paul however, writes in such a way that the text implies he must have dealt with the resurrection theme: so W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, London, 1948, p. 291 and A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul (transl. by W. Montgomery), London, 1931, p. 92. Of course the death of believers did constitute a problem for the early church, cf. I Cor. 11:29ff.; 15:1ff. By the time Paul wrote I Cor. he must have thought out the situation of 'the dead in Christ'. Perhaps he was still thinking it through when he preached at Thessalonica, or else he did not have enough time to explain everything in detail.



<sup>25</sup>Neil, op. cit., p. 99; Rigaux, pp. 527f.  
O. Cullmann, Christ and Time (transl. by F.V. Filson),  
London, 1951, pp. 240f.

<sup>26</sup>Schweitzer's interpretation of this passage is well-known, op. cit., pp. 75ff. Relying on apocalyptic views Paul's comforting answer is that the dead will rise to share in the Messianic Kingdom, cf. I Cor. 15:23-28; similarly J. Weiss, Der Erste Korintherbrief (Meyer, 10th edn.), Göttingen, 1925, p. 358. H. Lietzmann, An die Korinther I, II (H.Z.N.T., 2nd edn.); Tübingen, 1923, p. 81. Schweitzer goes on to write that this kingdom is only temporary and leads on to a general resurrection and the End. The citation of 4 Ezra 7:26ff.; II Bar. 30 and Rev. 20:2f. for this alleged Jewish strand of belief is totally inadequate since the works are post-Thessalonian. I.4:16ff. do not seem to imply any temporary state. P. Hoffmann, Die Toten in Christus, Münster, 1966, pp. 206-238, esp. p. 232, suggests Christians thought the resurrection was coming at the end of the Messianic kingdom. On the motivation of the passage, Harnisch, op. cit., pp. 19ff. who groups together scholars under two headings: (a) those who think the church supposed the Christian dead would not rise to share in the temporary Messianic Kingdom and (b) those who consider that the delay of the Parousia created an unexpected question for the new community.

<sup>27</sup>Dibelius on I.4:15, Best, pp. 193f.

<sup>28</sup>Cf. Rom. 14:14 with Mk. 7:15. Any allusion is very tenuous as with the other suggestions made.

<sup>29</sup>The view is held by A.H. Askwith, 'The Eschatological Setting of 1 Thessalonians', Exp. VIII.1 59-67; Orchard, op. cit., p. 23f. (allusion to Mt. 24:30f.; 25:6); D.M. Stanley, 'Pauline Allusions to the Sayings of Jesus', C.B.Q. 3 (1961) 26-39. L. Hartman, Prophecy Interpreted (Coniectanea Biblica, 1), Lund, 1966, p. 199 says Paul used a form of the Synoptic eschatological discourse.

<sup>30</sup>L. Cerfaux, Christ in the Theology of St. Paul, Edinburgh and London, 1959, p. 38.

<sup>31</sup>G. Wohlenberg, Der Erste und Zweite Thessalonicherbriefe, 2nd edn., Leipzig, 1909 and Frame, both ad. loc.; W. Foerster, 'Κυρίος' in T.D.N.T., III, p. 1092; A. Resch, 'Der Paulinismus und die Logien' in T.U., 12, Leipzig, 1904 pp. 338-341 and J. Jeremias, Unknown Sayings of Jesus, (transl. by R.H. Fuller, 2nd edn.), London, 1964, p. 14.

<sup>32</sup>Cf. Masson, ad. loc., who suggests a parallel with I Cor. 15:51f. where mystery could be a personal revelation or something mulled over and given in the Spirit.

<sup>33</sup>W. Marxsen, 'Auslegung von 1 Thess. 4:13-18', Z.Th.K. 66 (1969), 22-37, pp. 35f. The word is an early prophetic word come into the tradition as a word of the Lord. Cf. too Best, p. 193; Friedrich, '1 Thess. 5:1-11', op. cit., p. 299. and Harnisch, op. cit., p. 40.

<sup>34</sup>P.W. Schmiedel, Die Briefe an die Thessalonicher und an die Korinther (Hand-Commentar zum N.T.), Freiburg, 1892, p. 29 citing the following texts for Pauline revelations, Gal. 1:12; 2:2; II Cor. 12:1. Also J.G. Davies, 'The Genesis of Belief in an Imminent Parousia', J.Th.S. 14 (1963) 104-107.

<sup>35</sup>R. Bultmann, History of the Synoptic Tradition (transl. by J. Marsh, 2nd. edn.), London, 1968, p. 128, who asserts I.4:15-17 is a new dominical saying taken over from Jewish tradition.

<sup>36</sup>D. Hill, 'On the Evidence for the Creative Role of Christian Prophets', N.T.S. 20 (1973/74) 262-274. He looks at the evidence for prophecy in the N.T. and concludes that the creative role attributed to prophets by Bultmann and others is not warranted. He writes, p. 274, 'Another group, however important, can hardly have possessed the authority to speak in the name of the Risen Lord and have such declarations accepted'. Still prophets did have great authority being placed second in the lists of gifts or 'offices', 1 Cor. 12:28; Eph. 4:11.

<sup>37</sup>Cf. J. Jeremias, New Testament Theology, Pt. I. The Proclamation of Jesus (transl. by J. Bowden), London, 1971, p.2. He refers to Rev. 1:17-20; 16:15 etc. as examples of new sayings of Jesus.

<sup>38</sup>We have already noted Friedrich's rejection of this pericope. He believes op. cit., pp. 298ff. that we can detect a modelling of 5:1-11 on 4:9-18. (4:9 with 5:1; 4:13 with 5:6; 4:14-17 with 5:9f. and 4:18 with 5:11. But a mere repetition of phrases 4:9,18 with 5:1,11 do not justify an interpolation theory and the differences between 4:13, 14-17 and 5:6,9f. speak against it. Rigaux has dealt with Friedrich's theory by investigating the tradition and Pauline redaction of this section, 'Tradition et Rédaction dans I Th. V. 1-10', N.T.S. 21 (1974/75) 318-340. He argues that all the material in these verses shows connections with traditional apocalyptic ideas and/or is found in other Christian traditions.

<sup>39</sup>See chp. 1, pp. 3ff.

<sup>40</sup>On 'Times and Seasons' Strack-Billerbeck, II, p. 589 and H. Braun, Qumran und das Neue Testament, Vol. I, Tübingen, 1966, p. 234.

<sup>41</sup>Hebraic expression. Rigaux ad loc. for a résumé of the theme of darkness in O.T. and Jewish literature.

<sup>42</sup>There is no evidence for a traditional baptismal catechism (against Harnisch, pp. 131-142). The contrast of light and darkness, 'son of ...', emphasis on vigilance etc. do not indicate the need to understand the passage in this particular way. Nor need we suppose an attack by Paul on "gnostics" as implied by vv. 3, 6-8 particularly, cf. pp. 80, 112f., 138, 140.

<sup>43</sup>Thief imagery is found in the O.T. but not extant apocalyptic works: see Job 24:14; Jer. 29:9; Obad. 5 Joel 2:9. The last reference is in the context of the Day of the Lord, but refers to the invading army's approach, not to the Day itself. The imagery continues in Christian literature; Did. 16:1; Gospel Thomas, 21; Harnisch, op. cit., pp. 60-62, 84-116, has made a detailed study of the thief imagery. He concludes that it is part of the Jewish apocalyptic tradition, p. 94. However there is no such evidence, as we have already stated. Rigaux thinks the imagery in Q and Paul goes back to Jesus, loc. cit., p. 324.

<sup>44</sup>The risen Christ is symbolized by the thief in the Apocalypse.

<sup>45</sup>The Parables of Jesus (transl. by S.H. Hooke) London, 1963, pp. 48ff.

<sup>46</sup>Synoptic Tradition, p. 171. Jeremias and Bultmann agree that the delay motif is prominent in the present settings.

<sup>47</sup>If Paul was the source for later writers we might have expected the phrase, 'thief in the night', to be taken over as a unit.

<sup>48</sup>C.H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom, London, 1936, p. 167, argues that Paul "knew a tradition which contained the parable with an application substantially identical with that of Q", i.e. Mt. 24:43 and Lk. 12:39. This application to Advent expectations goes back, he surmises, to the very earliest stage of tradition. The whole of I.5:2f. contains statements from Jewish tradition cf. Harnisch, op. cit., p. 76, n. 83.

<sup>49</sup>Paul introduces the section with Ἐρωτῶμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς εἰδεῖν. He uses the more personal verb of request (see chp. 4, pp. 63f.) probably because he is dealing with a difficult point - respect for community workers.

<sup>50</sup>It is unlikely that we have a pre-Pauline hymn in vv. 6-10 (as W. Bornemann believes, Die Thessalonicherbriefe (Meyer, 6th edn.), Göttingen, 1894, ad. loc.). The texts, drawn from the LXX are woven together in a rhythmic style in order to heighten the thought of the public and glorious disclosure of Christ and the horror of the coming judgment. The material may well have come to him through the early church.

<sup>51</sup>C. Roetzel, 'The Judgement Form in Paul's Letters', J.B.L. 88 (1969), 305ff. maintains that in II.1:5-12 we have, what he calls, a Judgment Form, based on 4 elements in pre-exilic pronouncements, i.e. (1) Summons to hear (2) Accusation (3) Message Formula (Therefore) (4) Announcement (you shall be). The Pauline Form is slightly modified (1) Introduction (2) delineation of offence (3) punishment (4) Hortatory conclusion. In II.1:5ff, (3) precedes (2). He also finds the same Form in II.2:1-8. Paul may well have had such a pattern in mind, without it being too rigid. Cf. too, idem, Judgement in the Community, Leiden, 1972, pp. 91ff.

<sup>52</sup> ὁ κέρ : see chp. 4, pp. 65ff.

<sup>53</sup> νόος : see chp. 4, pp. 88f.

<sup>54</sup>See chp. 4, pp. 104-109.

<sup>55</sup>For a full discussion of the expression, see chp. 4, pp. 92-103.

<sup>56</sup>See chp. 1, p. 6.

<sup>57</sup>See chp. 5 for The Apostasy and chp. 6 for The Man of Lawlessness.

<sup>58</sup>The Katechon, chp. 7.

<sup>59</sup> οἰσκατε : see chp. 7, pp. 338ff.

<sup>60</sup>Withdraws : see chp. 7, pp. 350ff.

CHAPTER THREE

THE TEXT AND TRANSLATION OF II THESSALONIANS 2:1-12

A. The Greek Text

We have ignored a number of minor textual corruptions and have dealt with variants which could have a bearing on the exegesis of the passage. All major Greek texts have been consulted along with B. Metzger's, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament,<sup>1</sup> major commentaries<sup>2</sup> and Griblin's fairly comprehensive remarks<sup>3</sup>.

v.1 τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν . Omit ἡμῶν B<sup>pc</sup> sy<sup>h</sup>.

Manuscript evidence is very strong and all Greek N. Testaments retain it<sup>4</sup>. Griblin gives examples of this expression in an eschatological setting, cf. I.1:3; 2:19; 5:9 et al.

v.2 σοός. Add ὁμῶν D E 330 latt sy<sup>ph\*</sup> sa. cf. I Cor. 14:14. It has probably been added to give a more personal reference.

Μηδὲ θροεῖσθαι, μήτε διὰ πνεύματος... μήτε... μήτε.

For μηδέ read μήτε E K L P et al. Chrysostom.

Almost certainly an assimilation to the following triple

μήτε which occurs only here in Paul. For μή

... μηδέ see Rom. 14:21.

Ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου. Χριστοῦ for

κυρίου, K L et al. Unlikely in view of I.5:2 ἡμέρα

κυρίου and 5:4. The textual evidence is very weak.



v.3 ἀνομίας . X B 81 88<sup>mg</sup> et al. cop<sup>sa,bo</sup> arm

Marcion, Tertullian, et al. Ἀρκαρίας A D G K P Ψ

88\* pm lat sy got Marcion, Irenaeus, Tertullian,

Hippolytus et al. Whichever is correct, the sense is

little affected, cf. I Jn. 3:4. The Man is characterised

by either sin or lawlessness. In spite of the broad-

based support for 'sin' the other is slightly more probable.

a. In 2:8 the anti-God figure is termed 'The Anomos'.

b. We have a three-fold use of 'revealed' or 'revelation',

vv. 3,6,8; so if we read ἀνομίας we have a three-fold use of the word in vv. 3,7,8.

c. Copyists are more likely to have altered to ἀρκαρίας; Metzger.

v.4 τὸν καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ . Add ὡς Θεόν, (G) K L

pm sy<sup>P</sup>. Probably a gloss. A totally unnecessary expression as it is contained in the following statement.

v.5 The two variants ἐποῦ ὄντος for ὡν and ἐλέγετο for ἔλεγον have very little support and require no comment.

v.6 αὐτοῦ , X\* A K P pm:B D G al. read ἐαυτοῦ .

There is no need to accept ἐαυτοῦ since αὐτοῦ is emphatic by position and has a reflexive meaning.

Obviously the former helps to clarify the person referred to, and perhaps for this reason the U.B.S. text follows it.



v.7  $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\nu\ \delta\ \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\iota$ . Add  $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\tau\omega$

Support for this comes from the Latin tradition.

Obviously an interpretive<sup>ac</sup> comment.

v.8  $\iota\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ .

The evidence for this,  $\aleph\ A\ D^*\ G\ P$  and many other witnesses is too strong for its omission (B D<sup>C</sup> K pm). According to Griblin the addition of 'Jesus' to 'Lord' (without 'Christ') is proportionally more frequent in the letters to the Thessalonians: Nine times as against sixteen in all other letters.

v.8  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota$

The following points need to be made.

- (i) We can discount  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\iota\rho\epsilon\iota$  ; Hippolytus only.
- (ii)  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\lambda\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota$  is probably due to the following  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\rho\gamma\eta\sigma\epsilon\iota$ . MS support is not very strong, D<sup>C</sup> K pm sy<sup>p,h</sup> Origen, Basil and others.
- (iii)  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\theta\iota$  is a most unusual form; an impossible Aor. opt. ( $\aleph^3\ D^*\ G$ ).  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\lambda\omicron\iota$ ,  $\aleph^*$ , a present derived from  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\lambda\acute{\omega}\omega = \acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa\omega$ .
- (iv)  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota$  from  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\iota\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  (slay). Only here in Paul. Is this due to the influence of Is. 11:4 on the copyist's mind? Support comes from A B P al.

It is a difficult decision to have to make.

There is little support for  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\lambda\omicron\iota$  which is a possible translation here, 'whom the Lord Jesus consumes by ... and will destroy by ...'.  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\lambda\omicron\iota$  could be a corruption of  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\lambda\omicron\iota$  or an inexplicable compromise between  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\lambda\omicron\iota$  and  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota$ . It is less likely to point to  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota$ . The interchange of oi and ei is without parallel. We shall

read ἀνελεῖ , if only for its Manuscript support and possible allusion to Is. 11:4.

τῇ ἐπιφανείᾳ. τὴν ἐπιφανείαν: D\* K 251 483 cf. illustrationem (few MSS of vg) and illuminationem (g\*). Sirard<sup>5</sup> argues that the accusative preserves the correct reading with παρουσία (2:8) referring to the Anomos and οὗ (2:9) following on naturally. But as Frame<sup>6</sup> says 'the collocation of οὗ , which resumes ὅν (v.8 = τὸν ἄνομον ), with αὐτοῦ is more difficult to the eye than to the ear'. The dative has overwhelming MS support and parallels τῷ πνεύματι (2:8).

v.10 ἐν πάσῃ ἀπάτῃ . Add τῆς to the following ἀδικίας , D K L P. As Giblin notes, the absence of the article is favoured by its position before a defining genitive.

Ἐν before τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις and τοῦ Θεοῦ for τῆς ἀληθείας or Χριστοῦ added after it, have too little support for comment. They are explanatory glosses.

v.11 κέρπει. Πέρψει, K L P pl. it vg<sup>cl</sup> sy.

This is probably due to the use of the future in v.8. But this is to neglect the ἔστιν of v.9 and the paradox which is involved. The parousia of the Anomos is due to Satan and yet in the end it is God who sends the Lie.

v.12  $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ .  $\text{'A}\pi\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$   $\text{A G F al.}$

If we read either it makes no difference to the sense of the text.

$\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omicron\kappa\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ . Add  $\epsilon\nu$  before  $\tau\eta$   $\alpha\delta\iota\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha$ ,  $\text{A K L P al.}$  An unnecessary addition.

#### B. A Translation of II Thessalonians 2:1-12

1. But we ask you, brethren, to do justice to (and safeguard) the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ and our gathering to him,
2. in order that you are not quickly (easily) shaken from your understanding of the faith and disturbed; whether through a spirit utterance (prophetic word?), a word or letter, as if they were from us, making out that the Day of the Lord is here and now.
3. In fact, let no one deceive you in any way. If first The Apostasy has not come and The Man of Lawlessness been publicly unveiled, the son of destruction,
4. who opposes and exalts himself above every one termed god and every object of worship, so that he takes his seat in the temple of God, proclaiming that he is god - the Day of the Lord has not arrived (or, is still future, or, cannot have come).
5. Do you not remember that I often told you about these very things when I was with you?
6. And now, you are experiencing the Katechon in order that he (the Anomos) is to be publicly unveiled at his

appointed time.

7. For the secret plan of Anomia is already set in operation, only the Katechōn is present (now) until he withdraws.
8. And then the Anomos will be publicly unveiled, whom the Lord will slay (possibly, consume) with the breath of his mouth and render ineffective by the manifestation of his presence,
9. whose presence is due to Satan's domination and is with all power, false signs and false wonders
10. and with all deceit leading to unrighteousness, to those who are perishing. The reason is, they did not receive (accept) the love of the truth in order that they might be saved.
11. On this account God sends them a deluding error, with the express purpose of making them believe in The Lie,
12. and be judged - all who have not believed the truth but delighted in unrighteousness.

<sup>2</sup> ~~1~~ von Dobschütz, Frame, Rigaux. For the MS. tradition Rigaux, pp. 281-307.

<sup>1</sup> ~~2~~ London and New York, 1971.

<sup>3</sup> Giblin, op. cit., pp. 50-57.

<sup>4</sup> For the various forms used for God or Christ in the two letters von Dobschütz, Exkurs on I.1:1, pp. 60f.  
 ὁ κυριος ἡμῶν ἰησ. χρ. I.1:3; 5:9,23,28; II.2:1,14,16;  
 3:18. ὁ κυρ. ἰησ. χρ. II.3:6  
 ὁ κυρ. ἡμῶν ἰησ. I.2:19; 3:11,13; II.1:8,12.  
 It is very natural to retain ἡμῶν in this verse.

<sup>5</sup> L. Sirard, 'La Parousie de l'Antéchrist, II Thess. 2:3-9' in Analecta Biblica, 17-18, Rome, 1963, pp. 89-100.

<sup>6</sup> P. 268.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### AN ESCHATOLOGICAL PROBLEM FACING

#### THE THESSALONIAN COMMUNITY

We now proceed to a careful analysis of the structure and meaning of II.2:1-3a with the object of finding out what difficulties and dangers faced the young church. It is only when the problems are understood that Paul's later treatment of eschatological themes will be seen to be more relevant to the situation. We shall, therefore, pay close attention to the language and style of II.2:1-3a.

The δε of v.1 provides a general contrast between the preceding and following sections<sup>1</sup>. It is not a specific contrast of ἐρωτῶμεν with προσευχόμεθα 1:11. The particle<sup>2</sup> introduces a concern that the hope of chapter one and particularly v.10, ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐν δόξα καὶ θῆναι ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ will not be lost through any kind of deception. There is no mere transition from one aspect of the Parousia to another; rather through a false statement, the vivid expectation of the coming of Christ was in doubt<sup>3</sup>.

The author turns to request ( ἐρωτῶμεν ) the community to consider a subject which is vital to their and his interest<sup>4</sup>. In classical Greek the verb<sup>5</sup> meant mainly 'to inquire' and was used only in questions. By N.T. times it had become equivalent to the Latin 'rogare' even though it retained its former sense 'interrogare' in some places<sup>6</sup>. Since 'to request' is common in Koinē Greek<sup>7</sup>, there is no need to suppose a Hebrew substratum,  $\text{לְדַבֵּר}$ <sup>8</sup>.



The verb occurs four times within the Pauline Corpus and apart from Phil. 4:3, all are within the Thessalonian letters. It seems fairly certain that in spite of its association with παρακαλέω,<sup>9</sup> (2 out of the 3 cases mentioned, I.4:1; 5:11f.), it has its own distinctive flavour. It lays emphasis on the persons requested<sup>10</sup>. It has also been noted that in certain cases, where the request is conceived of in a question form, e.g. Lk. 14:18f.; Jn. 19:31, it bears the sense, 'Will you do so and so ...?' This yields a more personal touch in seeking an answer to the matter<sup>11</sup>. This may well apply here, 'We ask you. Will you do what we ask?'

There is no great significance to be attached to the use of ἀδελφοί. It is found frequently in both epistles, e.g. I.1:4; 2:1,17; 3:7; 4:13; 5:1; II.1:3; 2:13; 3:1,13. The word serves to underline the nature of the request; it is personal and links the author with his readers in a quite natural way. An example of this can be seen in I.5:12 where growing tension between the leaders and other members of the church forces Paul to request them to pay respect to the former; ἐρωτῶμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀδελφοί<sup>12</sup>. Perhaps the word (ἀδελφοί) had become a formality with Paul, but his readers would, no doubt, appreciate the sentiments it conveyed.

The opening few words, therefore, initiate, what is to be one of the most difficult eschatological sections in the N.T. and lead to the first grammatical problem. What is the object of the request? Does it lie in the ἡ τις ὑμῶν ἐξαπατήσῃ of v.3, or the εἰς τὸ ἡ κ.τ.λ.

of v.2? If so, what is the relation of ὑπὲρ τῆς παρουσίας to the verb ἐρωτῶμεν? We can only answer these questions by a detailed look at ὑπέρ<sup>13</sup>.

All recent commentators agree that the preposition has no adjectival sense<sup>14</sup>. It is pointless to adjure by a subject under dispute and ὑπέρ becomes used in a way foreign to the N.T. Most, therefore, give it the sense of 'concerning' (= περί). A few suggest some nuance derived from the meaning 'on behalf of'. We shall consider first the evidence adduced in support of ὑπέρ for περί.

1. There is a great deal of evidence for the interchange of meaning in Koinē Greek. The distinction between the two had become dull.<sup>15</sup> So P. Tebt I.19:4 (B.C. 114) ὑπὲρ ὧν ἐσήμαινες κέρψαι γεωργῶν ἀποσδέητοι, 'Concerning the cultivators whom you said you were sending, we do not require them.'<sup>16</sup>

2. There is frequent evidence that the two are regarded as synonymous in the textual tradition. It could be though, that this is due to a blurring of prepositions, which has taken place at a later time. As examples we can cite  
I.5:10 περί α \*B 33; ὑπέρ p<sup>30</sup> α c  
A D G. Gal. 1:4 περί p<sup>46</sup> α \* A D G;  
ὑπέρ p<sup>51</sup> B H 33.

3.  $\Pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}$  is used in the sense of  $\Upsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho$ .  
Bauer<sup>17</sup> cites Lk. 6:28; Col. 1:3 (v.l.

$\Upsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho$  ); 4:3; I.5:5; II.1:11; 3:1

etc. Here the preposition is used with certain verbs and nouns, such as 'ask', 'pray', 'prayer' and introduces the person or thing in whose interest the petition is made.

4.  $\Upsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho$  is used in the sense of  $\kappa\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}$  in the N.T. Blass-Debrunner<sup>18</sup> cite only 'Pauline' examples. II Cor. 8:23; 12:8; II.2:1; Phil. 1:7; 4:10. Moulton-Turner<sup>19</sup> add Jn. 1:30 (v.l.  $\kappa\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}$   $\mathfrak{X}^c A C^3$ ); II Cor. 1:8; I.3:2, noting that the practice is almost entirely confined to Paul. Moule<sup>20</sup> adds Acts 8:24; Rom. 9:27 and gives the translation for our passage, 'in connection with the coming'. Bauer is more indefinite with his classification. II Cor. 12:8 is placed under the heading 'Moving cause or reason' and translated 'with reference to',<sup>21</sup> and he does the same with II Cor. 8:23; II.2:1; II Cor. 1:7 only citing them under the heading 'About, concerning' ( $\kappa\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}$ )<sup>22</sup>. He says, significantly perhaps, that although  $\Upsilon\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho$  may be used for  $\kappa\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}$ , it still contains the sense 'in the interest of', 'in behalf of' as in Jn. 1:30; Rom. 9:27 etc.<sup>23</sup>.

These four arguments have convinced many scholars that we should translate it here 'concerning' or 'about'<sup>24</sup>. Before accepting this view a look at other passages in the Epistles, where ὑπέρ occurs, will reveal that the equation is not as simple as it looks.

I.3:2, παρακαλέ~~ει~~ ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν.

At first sight it might appear as though we have a parallel with II.2:1, ( παρακαλέω for ἐρωτάω ). But this is not so for two reasons:

- (a) The apostle is not asking or requesting his readers; he is positively encouraging or exhorting them.
- (b) As E. Best<sup>25</sup> comments, ὑπέρ = περί is too weak, as we need to bring in the idea of 'for the benefit of'.

II.1:4,5, ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑπομονῆς ὑμῶν; ὑπὲρ ἧς καὶ πάσχετε.

In both cases Frame<sup>26</sup> opts for 'concerning'. In the first instance this is more probable but in 1:5, πάσχω ὑπέρ carries the idea of 'on behalf of' or 'in the interest of' cf. Phil. 1:29; I Pet. 2:21.

I.3:9, ὑπέρ 439 1518. Clearly περί is the correct reading and the context shows the straightforward meaning 'concerning'.

I.5:10, τοῦ ἀποθανόντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν: ὑπέρ

p<sup>30</sup> α' c A D G; περί B α\* 33. In the light of

ἀποθνήσκω ὑπέρ Rom. 5:6ff.; 14:15;  
 I Cor. 15:3; II Cor. 5:15; διδόναι ὑπέρ p<sup>51</sup>  
 B H pm ( περὶ p<sup>46</sup> & \* A D G), Gal. 1:4;  
 παραδιδόναι ὑπέρ Gal. 2:20; Rom. 8:32; we should  
 probably read ὑπέρ . 'On behalf of' is a far more  
 meaningful construction.

In our view the interchange of the two prepositions  
 has been taken for granted all too easily<sup>27</sup>. In Thessalon-  
 ians ὑπέρ can bear the sense 'on behalf of' or 'in the  
 interest of'.

In the light of the comments we can approach 2:1.  
 There have been those who have felt the need to translate  
 'in the interest of'<sup>28</sup> or 'zugunsten'<sup>29</sup>. The thought then  
 being expressed is that in the interest of the coming of  
 Christ, the readers should beware of any deception. Their  
 interests would lie in a correct understanding of the future  
 event or the correct expectation for it. Von Dobschütz's  
 charge, that this meaning is too artificial, is unfounded.  
 On the contrary, the context seems to support this view  
 more than that of von Dobschütz, since the passage as a whole  
 is very much concerned with a correct understanding of future  
 events.

There is, however, one further possibility which  
 needs to be explored. In certain cases of ὑπέρ with  
 the genitive, we have to use an infinitive verb to provide  
 an appropriate translation<sup>30</sup>. Gal. 1:4, τοῦ δόντος  
 ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀρμεριῶν ἡμῶν, ὅπως 'who gave himself  
 to atone for (or remove) our sins'<sup>31</sup>.

Rom. 1:5, τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ,  
'to spread his name'.

Rom. 15:8, ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας Θεοῦ, 'to show the  
truth of God'.

II Cor. 1:6a,b, ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν παρακλήσεως (bis),  
comes to mean 'in order to comfort you', cf. II Cor. 12:9;  
I.3:2. So in our text; 'We ask you, brothers, to consider  
the Parousia'<sup>32</sup>, (with the thought of safeguarding a true  
appreciation of it or doing justice to it).

Perhaps we can approach the same conclusion by  
another route. There are a few texts in the N.T. where  
περί with ἐρωτάω virtually yields the content of  
the request in an infinitival form.

Lk. 4:38, καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν περὶ αὐτῆς,  
'And they asked him about (for) her', i.e. to heal her<sup>33</sup>.

Lk. 9:45, ἐρωτήσαι αὐτὸν περὶ τοῦ ῥήματος τούτου,  
'to explain it'.

Jn. 16:26 ἐγὼ ἐρωτήσω τὸν Πατέρα περὶ ὑμῶν,  
'to help you'.

Jn. 17:9, ἐγὼ περὶ αὐτῶν ἐρωτῶ,  
possibly 'I ask them to be guarded', cf. v.11.

There are two qualifications which we must make  
for this second approach.

(a) There is no example of ἐρωτάω with περί  
or ὑπέρ in Paul other than II.2:1. The verb  
is, of course, only used four times in Paul.

(b) In the examples given the preposition is περί  
not ὑπέρ. However if ὑπέρ was used it  
would yield the idea of something done involving



someone's interest.

We are suggesting therefore, that Paul used ὑκέρ to give the content of the request and that we can translate, 'To safeguard' or even, 'to do justice to' with the thought of self-interest.

We now come to the two events which are in danger of being misunderstood. The two words used, παρουσία and ἐπισυνάγωγη are linked by a single article<sup>34</sup>. No doubt this is to show the intimate connection between the two events and the personal interest of the readers in the former. This thought of Christ's coming and the saints coming with him occurs elsewhere, cf. I Cor. 15:23; I.3:13; 4:15ff; see also I.2:19; 5:23.

Both terms have been taken as technical terms in the N.T.<sup>35</sup>. As such it is usual to take the two to refer to Christ's return in glory for the purpose of gathering the saints to himself<sup>36</sup>. The first term<sup>37</sup> has had a long, varied and extensive history. Together with its cognate verb παρέμι it bears two senses.

- i) presence
- ii) coming, visit

It is applied (in a technical<sup>38</sup> or quasi-technical sense<sup>39</sup>) to the visits of kings or important officials and evokes the festivity, joy and trappings of such events<sup>40</sup>. Milligan says that the references to the parousia of a king

are sufficient to suggest an interesting comparison with the N.T. usage of the word to denote the Parousia of their King or Lord for which his people are to make ready<sup>41</sup>.

From the secular area, the term passed into cultic contexts and was used to describe the parousia of gods<sup>42</sup>. Little has been made of this when considering N.T. references<sup>43</sup>. It is just possible that the cultic use of parousia inspired Paul to declare the true Parousia<sup>This</sup> as was later to happen, in all probability, with the word Σωτήρ<sup>44</sup>. Any attempt to find a Jewish background will not succeed due to the lack of evidence<sup>45</sup>. We are left to suppose that there has been a deliberate borrowing of the Greek-Hellenist term for Christian purposes. It was a well-known word and evoked the very ideas which Christians attached to the thought of the coming of Christ. Just as the visit of a king created expectancy, excitement and activities to show the correct respect as well as the happiness of the occasion, so 'The Heavenly Visit' would create the same response<sup>46</sup>.

It is almost taken for granted that 'coming' is to the fore in the use of the noun. This we would want to question. We have already remarked that the verb and noun have two senses. In Pauline writings we find both. For example in I Cor. 16:17 Paul rejoices at the coming of Stephanus and others, whilst in II Cor. 10:10 the word can have no other meaning than presence, 'they say ... his bodily presence is weak'<sup>47</sup>. Yet whenever the translation 'coming' is considered appropriate, we have to ask though if the other sense has to be excluded or if, indeed, it could be uppermost in Paul's mind. If Paul is evoking a hellenistic royal visit does it mean that coming is the only thought in his mind? A royal visit, in our opinion, involves not only 'coming' but 'presence'.

In Cor. 16:17, which is cited so strongly for 'coming' it would appear that both senses are warranted. Paul explains why he rejoices at the parousia of friends, 'for that which was lacking on your part they supplied'. They could hardly do this if the word referred only to their coming. Let it be noted that Paul uses the present tense, χαίρω, to express his feelings. In other words he is saying, 'I am rejoicing now at their coming here and their actual presence! It is our contention that both senses are applicable to eschatological references; they are intimately related, as they would be in the minds of people greeting their ruler.

There are two other occurrences of παρουσία in our pericope. In 2:8 the Lawless One will be rendered useless τῇ ἐπιφάνειᾳ τῆς παρουσίας and in 2:9 we have the parousia of the Anomos. In both cases the sense of 'presence' predominates. In 2:8 if ἐπιφάνεια is translated 'manifestation' or 'appearance',<sup>48</sup> it does seem odd to use the phrase 'appearance of his coming'. It is better if we consider the phrase to mean 'manifestation of his presence'. The fact of his being there will destroy the Anomos. In 2:9 the verb ἐστίν supports the idea that the presence not arrival of the Anomos is to the fore. First, the following description of power, wonders and signs is more applicable to the presence of the Anomos than the coming of this figure. Second, as we shall show later ἐνέργεια comes to mean virtually 'possession',<sup>49</sup> and therefore links well with the thought of 'presence'. Third, following the three-fold use of ἀποκαλύπτω

we might expect the noun ἀποκάλυψις (or verb) for the coming itself instead of ἐστίν. The whole point of verse 9 appears to be, that Satan will possess the Antichrist and give him the necessary power throughout his existence. In our view there is a parallel between 'the presence of the Anomos' and 'the (subsequent) presence of Christ' which destroys the Anomos.

What we have determined for our pericope, also holds for the other eschatological references. It is impossible in I.2:19; 3:13; 4:15; 5:23 to exclude the idea of presence. It is not merely the descent and journey i.e. the actual coming, which makes the Christian happy. It is Christ's presence which assures the Christian that he has arrived. Returning therefore to II.2:1 we consider that the same understanding of parousia must be applied. Paul is requesting the church to safeguard their belief in the future presence of Christ. If they lost any part of the hope they were in danger of losing all that was implied and explained in I.4:13ff.

Although Paul used the word παρουσία in his letters, he may have already become aware of the danger of using this hellenistic term for a Gentile (-Jewish) church<sup>50</sup>. Cultic concepts gave the term the idea of spiritual 'presence' on which some could fasten their own ideas<sup>51</sup> and since we have shown too there is no clear cut distinction between 'presence' and 'coming' difficulties could have been created. Although the teaching of I.4:13ff. might be readily understood by Jewish-Christians, it could have posed real problems for pagan converts. Even if the

Parousia idea was pre-Pauline and well-established in mission teaching, cf. I.1:9f.; II.2:5, Paul still had to solve the problem of making Gentile converts appreciate and understand new ideas. The hurried 'exile' of Paul (Acts 17:10) left many things unsaid and undefined and a later letter, i.e. I, could have raised more problems than it solved. So the author is concerned in this section to show how literally and physically he imagined the Day of the Lord to be by outlining climactic events prior to the supreme manifestation of Christ's presence.

The other term, ἐπισυνάγωγη, brings the readers to another aspect which they have to safeguard. It is an aspect in which they had a very <sup>strong</sup> real interest and the ἥρῳν before the noun emphasizes this fact<sup>52</sup>. Here the noun is used in an eschatological way. Its cognate verb can be used in ~~very~~ ordinary contexts; the gathering to a door by a multitude, Mk. 1:33; Lk. 12:1. In Mt. 23:37 = Lk. 13:34 it describes how Jerusalem has missed the Messianic 'gathering'. Its use in connection with the final 'gathering' can be found in Lk. 17:37 and Mt. 24:31 ἐπισυνάξουσιν<sup>53</sup> τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς = Mk. 13:27 (- ἄγγελοι)<sup>54</sup>.

The noun is used only once more, Heb. 10:25, where it is set firmly in an eschatological framework. The 'gathering together' of Christians gains its purpose and value from the Day drawing near, ἐγγίσουσιν τὴν ἡμέραν<sup>55</sup>. I.4:15ff. sets out what Paul considers will be the nature of the future gathering to Christ. The background to this idea is not hard to seek. It is abundantly illustrated

in Biblical and non-Biblical texts, until its conversion into Christian terms<sup>56</sup>. Dt. 30:4; Ps. 105 (106):47; 49 (50):3ff.; Is. 11:11ff.; 27:13 speak of God bringing back his dispersed people<sup>57</sup>. The idea is continued in intertestamental literature.

II Mac. 2:7, ἕως ἀνσυναγάγῃ ὁ θεὸς ἐπισυναγωγῇ τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ ἕως γένηται.

Ps. Sol. 17:26, καὶ συνάξει λαὸν ἅγιον ὃς ἀφηγήσεται ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ.

ibid. 17:44, ἰδεῖν τὰ ἀγαθὰ Ἰσραὴλ ἐν συναγωγῇ φυλῶν, ἃ ποιήσῃ ὁ θεός.

T. Naph. 8:3, 'God shall appear ... σῶσαι τὸ γένος Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐπισυνάξει δικαίους ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν.

Charles<sup>58</sup> prefers to see here the idea of Gentiles who had not opposed Israel. In support he quotes I En. 10:21; 90:9-16, 18, 30. However the preposition ἐκ seems to favour the idea that the righteous are removed from (i.e. out of) the Gentiles. The reference to Israel in 8:2 seems to settle the issue; they are 'the righteous'. We have in this passage a re-affirmation of the hope for re-gathering dispersed Israel.

T. Ash. 7:7 describes how Gad and Dan have been scattered into foreign lands but ἐπισυνάξει ὑμᾶς κύριος ἐν πιστεὶ δι' ἐλπίδα εὐσπλαγχνίας αὐτοῦ<sup>59</sup>.

Although Paul shared the belief, in so far as he considered there would be a gathering at the End, the literal earthly approach has been radically altered. There were no tribes to be gathered from Gentile lands into Palestine. Christ not Jerusalem has become the focal point



of the 'assembly'. He makes this clear by his use of ἐκ' αὐτόν, v.1<sup>60</sup>. The people involved are Jews and Gentiles (the ἔθνη ) not tribes ( φυλαί ). The dead and living are to be raised to be united with Christ and the meeting ground is the ἀήρ . The emphasis is no longer on the dispersed being re-gathered but the assembling of a new holy people to their Lord, καὶ οὕτως πάντοτε σὺν κυρίῳ ἐσόμεθα <sup>61</sup>.

This 'gathering' has a further allied background for its origin. There are quite a few passages in the O.T. which speak of the nations or Jews gathering to Jerusalem to worship in the latter days. The event is conceived literally, but the object is mainly spiritual, cf. Is. 2:1ff.; 56:7f.; Micah. 4:1-3; Zech. 8:20-23; see also I En. 10:21; 90:6-16,18,30. There is no real stress in these texts on God's role in this, but there are points of contact with Paul's thought on the subject. One goes to Jerusalem to be taught of God, Is. 2:3; Zech. 9:22, and to be made God's own Is. 56:8.

We must ask at this point why Paul was so concerned about these two related beliefs, seeing that he fails to mention them again in 2:1-17<sup>62</sup>. The only possible reference could occur if we understand σωτηρία eschatologically in 2:13. It does seem strange that he does not deal with them directly. He could have forgotten and followed through a different line of thinking about the Katechon or else have dealt with them in a totally unexpected manner. The latter approach might have been dictated by the error some were accepting, namely ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου, 2:2.

Paul felt that to re-iterate I.4:13ff would be ineffective, if not inappropriate<sup>63</sup>. Whether  $\delta\iota' \epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\eta\varsigma$  refers to a false and/or unknown letter or I, it is clear that some readers had mis-understood or rejected his previous teaching on eschatology from that epistle. How else can we account for the statement in 2:2? We cannot be certain who caused the problem but it is reasonable to assume they were members of the Christian community. The reason for their statement could be three-fold.

- (i) They had failed to grasp eschatological ideas
- (ii) They had concentrated on their present salvation  
(see below)
- (iii) They had a desire to establish their own prophetic ideas within this new and ever-growing religion.

The way in which Paul treats the error shows that he does not regard it as 'heresy' or over-serious. If their statement had been wilful in intent it is probable that he would have had much more to say about the matter. There are hints too that the Apostle was not too certain about the situation, hence his warning of 3a, 'in any way'.

Two views have been expressed to suggest the relationship between Paul's opening request and vv. 3-12.

- (i) This has been held by the overwhelming majority of modern scholars from Bornemann to Best<sup>64</sup>. It emphasizes the temporal character of Paul's outline of what is to happen in the future. He does not want the community to be deceived in any way, 3a, because two things have to happen before the

Day of the Lord is present, 3b-4. V.6 continues the temporal scheme, outlining in more detail events which herald the End. If these things have not happened, then, it is implied, the Day cannot have come.

The aim of vv.3b-12 becomes clear. It is to quieten those who thought the Parousia and 'Gathering' had either come and gone or was overwhelmingly near. It presented to the community a picture of future events, in the light of which they could judge the truth of the situation cf. I Cor. 7:26-32; 10:14-22; II Cor. 6:14 - 7:1<sup>65</sup>. Moreover it clearly pointed out that there was to be a delay before the End, 2:6ff.; The Katechōn was at present performing a function. However strange Paul's approach may seem, it nevertheless is the way in which he attempts to safeguard the Parousia and its associated event.

~~However~~ This requires modification <sup>however</sup> in the light of our later discussion. If the assertion in Thessalonica, that the Day of the Lord ἐν ἐσθήκει, was understood by some in a different way from Paul (i.e. The coming of Christ) then perhaps Paul is safeguarding the Parousia by stressing:

- (i) Its literal and physical nature, especially in terms of its precursors, The Katechon, Anomos, Apostasy,
- (ii) The true nature of the Day of the Lord.  
In the O.T. the Day of the Lord not only marks the end of one epoch and the start of another, it is associated with the final

battle and overthrow of evil. Now in this section Paul spends a great deal of space (in relation to the whole) describing the Man of Lawlessness and his activity, vv. 3b, 4, 6-10 as well as judgment on the apostates, vv. 10-12; cf. Joel. 2:1-11; Ezk. 38:15-23; Is. 2:12; 13:9; Amos 5:20; Mal. 4:1; and many other references. In other words, Paul is not only explaining why he believes the Day has not arrived, but also describing the nature of the Day itself<sup>66</sup>. He has a dogmatic and pastoral concern in what he writes. He must not only correct the error, he must encourage his young converts in their future hope.

(ii) Recently Giblin has sought to cut the Gordian knot by suggesting that  $\delta \kappa \alpha \tau \acute{\epsilon} \chi \omega \nu$  is a present threat to faith of the Thessalonian community. He ( $\delta \kappa \alpha \tau \acute{\epsilon} \chi \omega \nu$ ) is not some present obstacle to Antichrist, but someone whom the church is 'experiencing' ( $\sigma \iota \delta \alpha \tau \epsilon$ ). Paul connects this present threat 'ontologically' with the future threat of the Anomos. The Apostle is looking forward

to the consummation of disbelief that is a condition for the Lord's own manifestation in glory as judge and rewarder, (Giblin's italics)<sup>67</sup>.

He modifies the view of von Dobschütz and Frame, that Paul is quietening fears of the future, by stating

Paul's pastoral concern may focus on on a proper understanding of the conditions entailed in the Christian's firm hope of final re-union with the Lord<sup>68</sup>.

The key word for Giblin is 'conditions'. He tries hard to reject the notion of temporal signs and replace it with conditions which will bring about the Parousia. However Giblin's view of vv. 3-12 presents serious difficulties.

- (a) He cannot eliminate the temporal orientation of the pericope by substituting 'conditions' for 'signs'. The very conditions for which he argues are themselves temporal as is shown by his own description of present threat, future Anomos and Christ's future victory<sup>69</sup>. What he is trying to do above all else is avoid saying that one sign is followed directly by another.
- (b) He objects to the first view in that it makes v.3ff. an excursus and v.6ff. an excursus to an excursus. Too many things are acting as 'delays' and this is unnecessary<sup>70</sup>. But the first view does not need to be interpreted in this way.
- (c) Giblin states that Paul is not arguing for a calendar date<sup>71</sup> (which scholars have argued for that anyway?) and goes on to quote

Dibelius<sup>72</sup> who says that Paul is warning his readers against the hope of an imminent Parousia. If so Paul must be concerned to put temporal considerations into a proper perspective.

(d) He refuses to supply anything to the anacoluthon of verse 4. He has a very vague discussion of the meaning of ἐνέστυκεν<sup>73</sup>. As it is critical to his view that Paul is laying down conditions the following points emerge.

- i. He does not wish to be precise about the meaning of ἐνέστυκεν.
- ii. He considers that even if we used ἐνίστυπνι in the anacoluthon it would add nothing to the coherence of Paul's thought.
- iii. He believes Paul does not want to introduce temporal concepts but only qualitative situations or conditions.

(e) Although Gibling has suggested a new solution to Katechon he has not provided a smoother connection between 2:1 and the following verses. There is quite a separation between the threat now and the threat (Anomos) to come (v.6), when it appears that there is a very close link between the cessation of the Katechōn and the appearance of the Anomos.



Giblin's scheme makes for difficult reading and in numerous cases we are left thinking that he relies on special pleading for the points he makes. However he has added a corrective to the First View. Paul is not writing about signs per se, nor is he merely saying, the Day of the Lord is not "a date on a calendar of human reckoning"<sup>74</sup>. Paul's basic concern is to show the nature of the Day, which is a future event and therefore cannot have come. Our own view is therefore a modification of the First.

We shall now look at the problem facing Paul and the Thessalonians under three headings.

1. The Pastoral Concern of the Apostle in the face of the problem.
2. The statement which caused the problem.
3. The possible origin of this problem.

1. The Pastoral Concern of the Apostle in the Face of the Problem

At first glance it would seem that εἰς τό should introduce a purpose or result clause; 'we ask you ... in order that (so that)'. The way εἰς τό is used by Paul to denote purpose or result predominates in his letters<sup>75</sup>. It is, in effect, equivalent to τοῦ plus the infinitive used in Luke<sup>76</sup>. εἰς τό can be regarded as ἵνα or ὥστε. We should remember that "the Semitic mind was notoriously unwilling to draw a sharp dividing line between purpose and consequence"<sup>77</sup>.

We have already written earlier that many scholars argue or assume that εἰς τό introduces the content of the request. Such a parallel is alleged to be found in I.3:10, δεόμεθα εἰς τὸ ἰδεῖν. So in II.2:2 the content is specified<sup>78</sup>, or as some have put it with reference to the purpose sense of εἰς τό, the matter of the request is stated as its aim<sup>79</sup>.

There are however, a few considerations which make unnecessary the use of εἰς τό as ἵνα (= that) after a verb of request. Before doing so we shall note the comments of two important N.T. Grammars. Blass-Debrunner, under a minor heading, 'Freer Usage', take I.3:10 to be equivalent of ἵνα ἰδωμεν i.e. introducing the content of the prayer<sup>80</sup>, they compare 2:12 and 4:9. Moulton-Turner<sup>81</sup> agree on I.3:10, and think 2:12 could be a simple infinitive or ἵνα after verbs of exhorting; whilst 4:9 is regarded as epexegetic. It is on this evidence that II.2:2 is judged. The following considerations make this uncalled for.

- (a) Ἐρωτάω certainly requires a complement. If this is found in ὑπὲρ τῆς καρυοτίας, as we have argued previously, then we can treat εἰς τό in the way Paul so often uses it in his letters.
- (b) The supposed parallels of Ἐρωτάω with εἰς τό, I.4:1 and the infinitive εἰδεῖν κλ, I.5:12 do not justify us regarding εἰς τό as a similar construction. If the εἰς was omitted the case for regarding II.2:2 as introducing content would be very strong.
- (c) Apart from the three references, I.2:12; 3:10; 4:9<sup>82</sup>, there do not appear to be any other Pauline examples in which the phrase can be taken as content after verbs of 'asking', 'requesting' and 'praying'. Out of the thirteen times Paul uses εἰς τό in I and II Thessalonians, nine occurrences quite naturally take a purpose or result sense, cf. I.2:16; 3:2,5,13; II.1:5; 2:6,10,11; 3:9. That leaves the three references cited above and our passage. On I.3:10 Rigaux writes,

Mais εἰς τό peut, avec un infinitif pris substantivement après un verb de prière conserver son sens final I Thess 3:10: priant pour vous revoir. De même dans 2:2 (surely 2:12): pour que vous vous comportiez.

even though he rejects that sense in II.2:1<sup>83</sup>.

If the second clause in I.3:10, which runs

δεόμενοι εἰς τὸ ἰδεῖν ὑμῶν τὸ πρόσωπον  
καὶ καταρτίσαι τὰ ὑστερήματα τῆς πίστεως  
ὑμῶν is regarded as parallel to the first,  
ἰδεῖν κ.τ.λ., it is obvious that εἰς τὸ must

introduce purpose. Similarly in 2:12, 'exhorting,  
encouraging you and testifying, to the end that ...

'The verbs explain how Paul and his companions  
dealt with the community and the purpose of what  
they did. I.4:9 has little in common with  
II.2:2; ὑμεῖς Θεοδιδάκτοί ἐστε εἰς τὸ  
ἀγαπᾶν ἀλλήλους. Even there purpose or  
result need not be excluded: 'You are taught of  
God so that you love one another'.

- (d) The grammars do not refer to II.2:2 as an example  
of the construction (except for Robertson<sup>84</sup>)  
and inadequate proof is offered to suggest that  
Paul has used εἰς τὸ for anything other than  
purpose or result; his regular usage.

#### Conclusion <sup>to</sup> the Discussion on εἰς τὸ.

In view of the evidence which we have presented  
we feel that there is no reason for rejecting a final or  
result clause for II.2:2<sup>85</sup>. We ought not to be too precise  
in choosing between the two types of clause; Paul could well  
have written, 'we request you ... in order that you are not  
moved' or 'so that you are not moved'<sup>86</sup>.

Having determined in our exegesis that v.1 contains the content of the prayer and v.2 the intended aim or result, we can look in detail at the two verbs which follow. First of all σαλεύω . This is used to emphasize the idea of shock. Coupled with it is the adverb ταχέως . This word is thought by most to have a modal rather than temporal force<sup>87</sup>. Lünemann goes too far when he asserts it means, 'so soon after the matter in question was spoken of'<sup>88</sup>. The context does not supply this thought. The only temporal point in II.2:1ff. which could be related to the adverb occurs in 2:5, ἐπεὶ ὡς πρὸς ὑμᾶς. It could be that ταχέως refers back to the time of the mission. However it is more likely that Paul is stressing the manner of their being shaken. They were not to be easily shaken from what they knew to be true.

The verb σαλεύω<sup>89</sup> (from the root σάλλω Lk. 21:25) is used in an apocalyptic setting in Mt. 24:29 = Mk. 13:25. Here the reference is to a literal shaking of the heavens. This literal meaning occurs elsewhere in the N.T. Mt. 11:7 = Lk. 7:24; Acts 4:31; see also Is. 7:2; Jer. 28:3; Eccles. 16:18. In our passage it describes mental disturbance and is used in a figurative way, cf. Acts 17:13 (coupled with ταρασσώ); 2:25; Heb. 12:26, 27(?); see also Ps. 9:27 (10:6); 29 (30:6); I Mac. 6:8; Ps. Sol. 8:39; 15:6.

The verb is frequently, in fact invariably, associated with violent or sudden disturbances<sup>90</sup>. The foundations of the prison house at Philippi were suddenly shaken, Acts 16:26; the Jews of Thessalonica came stirring up and

troubling (confusing) the crowds, Acts 17:13<sup>91</sup> and in Acts 2:25, David will not be 'moved' (quoting Ps. 16). In II.2:2 the shock may come possibly through three means, 2:2b, but its nature is described in the added ἀπὸ τοῦ νοός. Lightfoot<sup>92</sup> has sought an illustration from the literal meaning of the word to explain the reference here. He suggests that they are not

to be driven by feverish expectation from your sober senses, as a ship drifts away under a tempest from its moorings.

He bases this on σαλεύεσθαι ἐπὶ ἄγκυρας meaning 'to ride at anchor' which is opposed to ἀποσαλεύειν ἄγκυρας or σαλεύειν ἀπὸ ἄγκυρας, see Plutarch, Moralia 2.493D where ὄρεξιν τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν ἀποσαλεύουσιν is almost immediately followed by ὡς ἐκ' ἄγκυρας τῆς φύσεως σαλεύει. It is unlikely that Paul had this in mind when he wrote the letter and Findlay says that νοός can scarcely hold the office of anchor to the soul<sup>93</sup>.

We could translate the verb by 'shaken', 'disturbed' or 'moved'<sup>94</sup>. Any one of these would be more than satisfactory in the context since together they express the idea of tottering. It should be noticed however that the use of the Aorist does suggest a definite act rather than a process. They are not to be knocked off balance easily, in one go. Σαλεύω is used with ἀπό in Ps. 32:8; I Mac. 9:13 and here, II.2:2 where the preposition means respectively, 'at the moment of', 'by' and 'from'. Since it has pregnant force we are justified in translating 'hinweg'<sup>95</sup>.



'Shaken from their mind'<sup>96</sup>. Νοῦς occurs frequently in Romans and I Corinthians, three times in the Pastorals (I Tim. 6:5; II Tim. 3:8; Tit. 1:15) twice in Ephesians (4:17,23) and Revelation (13:18; 17:9) and once in Luke (24:45) Philippians (4:7) and Colossians (2:18). Most commentators take it to mean 'sober sense' or "nüchtern und besonnen urteilende Verstand"<sup>97</sup>. They do so for two reasons. First, it cannot in the passage mean 'intellect' or 'organ of understanding', and second, it is generally thought that the community were in danger of being shaken from their νοῦς by feverish enthusiasm for the imminent Parousia<sup>98</sup>. So the simple word 'understanding' is thought to be inadequate. It is their 'judgment' which may falter<sup>99</sup>. A few commentators are clearly not satisfied with this. Bornemann, commenting on the σκλ. ἀπὸ τοῦ νοός says it is a removal from the right standpoint<sup>100</sup>. Rigaux accepts that the total expression means basically 'not driven from good sense', but qualifies it by adding that this refers to the faculty of their sane judgment<sup>101</sup>. These two are attempting to give νοῦς its more natural sense of 'the understanding of some idea or another' or 'the ability to do so'. We agree with Alford that the sense is that of not being shaken from a mental apprehension of the subject<sup>102</sup>.

In spite of two references which are often cited in favour of 'good sense' it is more likely that they support the meaning of 'understanding' or 'apprehension'. In I Cor. 14:14,15 Paul is very concerned to show that speaking in tongues only affects the πνεῦμα, whilst the νοῦς is left baffled, i.e. the comprehension of

what is said. Similarly in the next verse, he says he wants to sing and pray with the  $\sqrt{o\delta\varsigma}$ , i.e. true understanding. There is no thought of judgment or good sense, cf. I Cor. 14:19. It seems likely that Paul intends the same thought in 2:2. The community were not to be shaken 'from the comprehension of what they had been taught'. Two further points support this view.

- (i) To give  $\sqrt{o\delta\varsigma}$  the meaning 'sober sense' would be to give it a unique meaning in the N.T.
- (ii) If the Day of the Lord has been 'spiritualised' by some members of the community, it makes excellent sense to warn all against being shaken from a true understanding (comprehension) of what they had been taught.

The second verb which Paul uses is  $\theta\rho\omicron\epsilon\omega$ . This word occurs only three times in the N.T., here and Mt. 24:6 = Mk. 13:7<sup>103</sup>. In view of its occurrence in Mark, it has been thought that we have a word of the Lord<sup>104</sup>. Whatever the truth of this suggestion, the word itself is very difficult to define. It occurs only once in the LXX, Cant. 5:4, for which Bauer<sup>105</sup> gives it the basic meaning of 'inwardly aroused'. The Hebrew reads, 'my bowels were moved (murmured) for him'.<sup>106</sup> In the light of Jer. 31:20 this could mean 'yearned for him'. Some Hebrew MSS read  $\text{לָבַב}$  for the MT.  $\text{לָבַב}$ , so we have the suggestion of 'perturbed' or 'disturbed within me', (cf. RSV, 'was thrilled'). The LXX  $\eta\ \kappa\omicron\iota\lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\theta\rho\omicron\eta\theta\eta\ \epsilon\pi'\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu$  favours the MT. In either reading of the Hebrew the verb can be translated

'disturbed'. We have stress either on the object 'for him' or the inward emotions. The noun  $\theta\rho\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  is found in Wis. 1:10 and I Mac. 9:39. In both instances it has the meaning of 'noise' and 'tumult', but this does not help our understanding of the verb in II.2:2.

If we apply our study of Cant. 5:4 to Mk. 13:7, the idea of disturbance admirably suits the context. They will hear of wars; but they, the disciples, are not to be disturbed. That is, fears and anxieties which arise from such events are not to affect their faith. The same is true of 2:2; 'in order that (so that) ... you are not disturbed through this means or that ...'. We ought to be careful not to translate the verb by such words as 'alarm', 'terrify', 'frighten'<sup>107</sup> or 'erschrecken'<sup>108</sup>. The error which might have disturbed them, and might go on doing so (Present tense), need not have alarmed or frightened the community. Its main result will be to cause the church confusion as to the correct belief or else encourage error. In this way the community will be disturbed and not by the excitement of the imminent End. In this connection the verb is almost certainly passive, in the light of  $\sigma\chi\epsilon\upsilon\theta\eta\iota\kappa\epsilon\iota$  <sup>109</sup>.

### Conclusion

We are now in a position to summarise this first section. Paul has asked the community to safeguard the Parousia and the Assembly to Christ, in order that (so that)

1. they would not be shaken easily from their understanding of the faith (their comprehension of what they had been taught),

ii. they would not go on being disturbed (troubled).

The Apostle thus shows a pastoral interest in their welfare and a dogmatic concern for a true understanding of Christian truth. The shock may be sudden (Aorist) and continue to have a disturbing effect (Present).

## 2. The Statement which Caused the Problem

The statement is all too briefly recorded in the words, ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου<sup>110</sup>. It is clear from its very first use in Amos 5:18-20 that 'The Day of the Lord' was an expression already popular with the people of that time. The term continued to be used by later prophets to describe the Day of the great intervention of Yahweh<sup>111</sup>. It was the Day when evil was to be banished and righteousness restored. At some stage in the life of the early church, and probably at a very early stage, the Jewish term was given a Christian orientation (cf. παρουσία; only a later stage):  $\overline{\text{nnn}}$  now meant Christ. In I.5:2 the same formula is found except that both nouns are anarthrous, indicating a well-known and fixed formula<sup>112</sup>. The word 'Day' is used by Paul on its own or in connection with other words to describe the future Day when Christ would gather his saints, reward them appropriately and judge the world<sup>113</sup>.

The Day

I Cor.3:13;

cf. Rom. 2:16; 13:11.

That Day

II.1.10.

Day of our Lord Jesus Christ, I Cor.1:8.

Day of our Lord Jesus, II Cor.1:14.

Day of Jesus Christ, Phil.1:6.

Day of Christ, Phil.1:10; 2:16.

It is clear from I and II Thessalonians that Paul understood Parousia and Day of the Lord to refer to the same event. Parousia is used frequently with a note of joy and expectancy and with reference to the Christian's hope, e.g. I.2:19,20. Day of the Lord, on the other hand, emphasizes more the aspect of judgment, but we cannot draw a hard and fast distinction between the two, cf. II Cor. 1:14.

What did people mean when they said the day ἐνεστυγεν ? We can only answer the question by looking at the meaning of this verb<sup>114</sup>. It occurs seven times in the N.T.; Rom. 8:38; I Cor. 3:22; 7:26; Gal. 1:4; II.2:2; II Tim. 3:1; Heb. 9:9. A glance at these references will reveal a meaning of 'the present', 'the here and now'. For that reason the verb is suitable to contrast with the future, as in Rom. 8:38, οὐτε ἐνεστώτα οὐτε μέλλοντα, cf. I Cor. 3:22; Gal. 1:4<sup>115</sup>. In II.2:2 the most natural translation for the perfect is 'has come' or 'is present'<sup>116</sup>. The evidence in favour of this is overwhelming, as is clear from the LXX, Papyri and N.T. For examples we can refer to III Kgdms. 12:24 B text 'present year'; I Esd. 9:6 'present foul weather', and P. Fay. 28:10 (2nd century A.D.) εἰς τὸ ἐνεστώσ ἰδ. (ἐτος)<sup>117</sup>.

The attempt of Warfield<sup>118</sup> to give it the meaning of 'upon us' or by others 'at hand'<sup>119</sup> is entirely dictated by the problem of how the Day of the Lord could be said to be actually present. In certain passages where ἐνίστημι occurs the verb does seem to have the connotation of threatening, that is if something is hostile<sup>120</sup>. II Mac. 12:3, the Men of Joppa were invited into the boats with wives and



children as if they meant no harm at all or literally, 'as no one threatened to them ill-will'; ὡς μηδεμιᾶς ἐνεστώσης πρὸς αὐτοὺς δυσμενείας. II Mac. 4:43, charges were brought against Menelaus, lit. 'A trial was impending over M',<sup>121</sup> περὶ δὲ τούτων ἐνέστη κρίσις ἐπὶ (or πρὸς) τὸν Μενέλαον, cf. too III Mac. 3:24. It is thought<sup>122</sup> that this sense of impending, threatening could be present in I Cor. 7:26 and II Tim. 3:1, but 'present' or 'come' is entirely appropriate. In the former the distress is not threatening, it is present and in the latter, terrible times shall come, not threaten. The thought of 'impending' is not suitable for II.2:2 since the Day of the Lord is hardly a hostile event for the Christian, cf. I.5:2.

If it is accepted that 'has come' is the most natural meaning for the perfect we are presented with a problem. How could the Day have actually arrived without the community knowing that it had? It must have been very clear that no outward manifestation of the Parousia had taken place. Scholars have recognised the problem and attempted to answer it in two ways.

1. Von Dobschütz takes the verb in the sense of "die fast zur Gegenwart gewordene Zukunft" (the future which is almost present)<sup>123</sup>. He is followed by others such as Dibelius<sup>124</sup>, De Boor ('Der Tag steht unmittelbar bevor')<sup>125</sup> and Oepke<sup>126</sup>. The latter cites Blass-Debrunner para. 323 (3) in support of the idea, 'in the process of coming'. Even Rigaux, who admits

the usual meaning of *ἐνίσταται*, finds the problem too much and says the Apostle used 'has come' because it is more forceful than 'is imminent'. He suggests that the Thessalonians, in their agitation, could have said the Day 'avoir commencé',<sup>127</sup>. We have no evidence of agitation in this passage and there is quite a difference between imminency and actual arrival. This view holds that certain members of the community were saying 'the Day is imminent'.

2. Other scholars recognise the problem but urge that the Day of the Lord is not the equivalent of Parousia. It stands for a period of time, during which events take place, and culminates in the coming of Christ<sup>128</sup>.

Both views are unsatisfactory for the following reasons.

1. If the Day of the Lord is equivalent to the Parousia both in Paul's mind and theirs, then the second view is invalid<sup>129</sup>.
2. The Thessalonians could have thought the Day was a period of time, which included events leading up to the End and the End itself. But if they did, where did they find support for this view? Certainly nothing which Paul had written in the first Letter could suggest it. In fact 'the thief metaphor', I.5:2, shows that Paul viewed it as a very

dramatic event, a sudden happening; it was not a gradual process of events, even though, as we mentioned earlier, certain events are closely allied with it<sup>130</sup>. Paul's view is shared by every other N.T. writer, cf. Heb. 10:25; II Pet. 3:10; Rev. 16:14. As we have emphasised before, these new converts were mainly Gentiles not Jews and were ignorant of the O.T. background. How could they re-interpret the term in this particular way? It might be argued that the Jews in the church could conceive of the Day as a period of time. Against this we urge two forceful arguments.

(a) The Day of the Lord in the O.T. is a very definite event which marks off one epoch from another<sup>131</sup>. It is not a period of time nor must it be confused with such expressions as 'the days to come' Amos 4:2; 8:11; Jer. 7:32 or 'in those days' Jer. 3:16ff. or 'at that time' Amos 5:13; Is. 18:7. The Jews would have been brought up to look for one day, the Day<sup>132</sup>.

(b) If we look at the places where 'Day of the Lord' occurs in the O.T. we shall note the close association it has with darkness, evil, violence, desolation etc. and finally judgment. Now it may be proposed that this is part of 'the Day'. If that were so, would members of the church be able to claim that those features were present in the early part of the sixth decade of the first century? The prophesied horrific descriptions of lawlessness and violence before the Day came could hardly apply to the time when II was written.

It is unlikely then, that the Thessalonians understood the Day in this way.

3. If the Day was said to be imminent would not the Thessalonian group, and Paul too, have used the word ἐγγίςω . It would have described their view more easily and accurately. If we assume that the Parousia was said to be imminent, the Day had come i.e. the End period, what is the difference between that assertion and the view of Paul and others that the Day is at hand? (Mt. 24; Rom. 13:1f.; Phil. 4:5; I.1:10; .3:13; Heb. 10:25,37; James 5:8; I Pet. 4:7; I Jn. 2:18; Rev. 22:30. There appears to be very little difference. Most <sup>h</sup>scholars believe Paul expected the Parousia in his life-time<sup>133</sup>. The only solution could be that Paul expected signs before the actual End or Day, whereas others dispensed with such expectations. This again is unlikely.

4. The reference to Blass-Debrunner para. 323 (3)<sup>134</sup> to support the first view is inadmissible for the following reasons.

- a. The context gives no indication that the time of the event lay in the future from the standpoint of those who said that the Day is here.

- b. All examples cited are confined to the Gospels and Acts 20:22.
- c. All examples in para. 323 (1-3) concern the futuristic use of the present. In 2:2 we have a perfect. Another form of the verb would be more appropriate.
- d. The verbs used in this way are common words for 'to go' or 'to come'.

It is our contention therefore that we must look for a different explanation of the phrase. Should we then think that some had taught that Christ had returned in a quite different way or that a great event had transpired in a way of which they were unaware?<sup>135</sup> In other words the Day had been stripped of the physical events normally associated with it. If this were so it is hard to believe that the church as a whole would be in danger of believing it. Could the church be deluded into thinking it had happened secretly or spiritually? Surely false teachers would have something better and more plausible to offer the church?

Our own view starts from the assumption that many had just been converted from heathendom. With Paul's missionary stay so short and surrounded by trouble, we should not be surprised if the new community had difficulty grasping Christian truth. Moreover we suppose that quite a bit of I was new to them. Is it any wonder that they failed to appreciate and understand all that they were taught? It

would take a little time before eschatological concepts were viewed in the light of the O.T. How easy it would be for some to see 'The Day of the Lord' as here and now for was not the present age His Day - a time of salvation and blessing?

Rigaux<sup>136</sup> has already noted that in the Epistles we have the germ of present salvation. It is now a time of the Spirit and His work, I.1:5f.; 4:8; 5:19; God's power ( *δύναμις* ) is active, I.1:15; salvation is obtained for them and possessed by them, I.5:9; cf. II.2:10,13. To this we can add the great emphasis Paul placed upon their present spiritual and ethical standards, I.4:1-8; 5:12ff. Their aim now is to abstain from fornication, to keep themselves in honour and sanctification and to wrong no one, I.4:3-6. To most converts this would naturally be their goal. They had become Christians to escape from idolatry and its evils to serve the living God, I.1:9f.<sup>137</sup>

Further, if part of the kerygma consisted of this statement, or something similar, *ἐφ' ἧς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ*, Mt. 12:28 = Lk. 11:20, it is not difficult to imagine that the Day of the Lord had actually come in the complex of events which included the life, death and resurrection of Christ and the giving of the Spirit<sup>138</sup>. We get a similar picture in Acts 2:17-21. Peter's sermon sets out to show that Joel's prophecy is fulfilled. The events depicted in Joel have occurred. In particular, the gift of the spirit, so prominent a feature of Lucan history, had been given, Acts 2:38; 10:45; cf. 8:15,20; 19:2f. Such statements could make some Christians assume the Day was



here and now in the reality of their present salvation.

The evidence however for the presence of Gnosticism in the church is insufficient in spite of Schmithals'<sup>139</sup> argument and Marxsen's<sup>140</sup> suggestion that we have a hint of a Gnostic idea being expressed apocalyptically, cf. II Tim. 2:18. We cannot determine if the group who made the statement recorded in II.2:2 thought this way or not. In a short but illuminating article Peel<sup>141</sup> has shown that contrary to the common opinion Gnostics did have diverse End-expectations along with their 'translation' of future views into present reality.

It is very interesting, if not significant, that some Thessalonians spoke of the Day of the Lord and not the Parousia. It would be hard to accept any view which suggests that they had lost all future hope<sup>142</sup>. It could be that they held to the future coming of Christ, while visualising the Day of the Lord as present salvation<sup>143</sup>. Still even the word Parousia could be dangerous. It held cultic overtones (= the presence of a God) and these may have impressed certain believers more than the reference to a visit of a hellenistic ruler. We have mentioned above that as far as we know Paul ignores this word after I Corinthians. Even the phraseology of I.5 might have aided the misunderstanding. On the one hand v.2 mentions the Day of the Lord as a thief in the night, but on the other believers are called (vv.5ff.) 'sons of the Day' who were to watch and be sober. 'We are' says Paul, 'of the Day', and even his reference to future salvation could lead to confusion I.5:9 cf. wrath in I.2:16.

We are not suggesting a view of 'realised eschatology', for that effectively denies any eschatology at all, but a new meaning to the expression Day of the Lord. Some regarded it as a term denoting the present realities of salvation.

So what Paul does in the face of the problem is to answer it by re-emphasizing the nature of the Day. We have already pointed out the close association of the heightening of evil and violence, war against God's people and judgment with the Day of the Lord. In our pericope these are the very features which Paul chooses to convince his readers that the Day has not come; the Apostasy, The Man of Lawlessness, the 'attack' on God and His people have yet to happen. This is why the Day cannot have come.

The situation at Corinth shows certain parallels. Apparently the error there tended to exalt the immaterial and deprecate the material<sup>144</sup>. Ellis is quite right in pointing out that what was denied was not the after life, but bodily resurrection; otherwise why else baptise *ὁ κέρ* the dead, I Cor. 15:29<sup>145</sup>. The problem seems to be paralleled in II.2. If some Athenians thought *Ἀνκιστάσις* was a goddess (Acts 17:18) it is not strange if we consider 'Day of the Lord' to be just as foreign to the Thessalonians Paul too has a similar approach in dealing with the error.

(a) He does not reprimand the Corinthians for their view but, in effect, asks them to do justice to his, I Cor. 15:10f.

(b) He makes positive assertions such as Christ has been raised, 15:20 and outlines the nature of the resurrection

body, cf. 'First the Apostasy must come etc. ...' and the description of the Anomos and his activity. II.2:3f., 6-10.

(c) He makes the problem personal by asking if faith is in vain 15:14,19, and then going on to show their share in the ultimate triumph over death, 15:50ff. Similarly the Day of the Lord inaugurated a period of salvation, a purified people Is. 9:1ff.; 10:20ff.; Zeph. 3:8ff.; Jer. 31:31ff.; Ezek.37 and describes how believers have been chosen from the beginning unto salvation in sanctification of the Spirit and faith in the truth. They are the purified people.

We have now come to an end of this second section, in which the following conclusions have been drawn.

- i. 'Εἰς ἡμᾶς means 'has come'.
- ii. The Day of the Lord had been re-interpreted 'spiritually' by some members of the Thessalonian church. By this we mean that they used the phrase to refer to their present blessings of salvation. Beyond this the evidence does not allow us to go. Any theory which suggests a form of gnosticism or 'realised' eschatology', in which all reference to the future is deleted, cannot be substantiated.
- iii. The Day of the Lord for Paul concerned a definite event in association with others. His answer to the community was to outline those events.
- iv. The error was not serious enough for him to stigmatise a particular group.

v. The problem arose for two main reasons

- (a) The Thessalonians needed time to adjust to the ideas of their new faith.
- (b) Paul had too short a missionary stay to instruct the converts completely.

### 3. The Possible Origin of this Problem

We now turn our attention to the sources of this statement and the means by which it was spread, διὰ πνεύματος ῥήτε διὰ λόγου ῥήτε δι' ἐπιστολῆς . With these three we can link v.3a, κατὰ ῥηθέντα τρόπον suggesting that there might be other ways by which the Thessalonians could be deceived. We shall leave for the moment discussion of the phrase ὡς δι' ἡμῶν and its relation to the three mentioned sources.

#### A. Spirit

Most commentators think of πνεῦμα in a more 'concrete' sense and equate it with προφητεία , even though this yields an unique sense in the N.T.<sup>146</sup>. Appeal is frequently made to I Cor. 12:10, ἄλλω (δὲ) προφητεία , which may correspond to ἀποκαλύψις , I Cor. 14:6, 26, and be linked to seeking τὰ πνευματικά, μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα προφητεύητε , I Cor. 14:1. This connection with 'prophecy' is further related to the reference in I.5:20, προφητείας μὴ ἐξουθενεῖτε . As the phrase ὡς δι' ἡμῶν apparently shows Paul wanting to dissociate himself from the error and its source, it can only be that either some said Paul had given a prophecy, which was clearly false, or else the prophecy was uttered by a prophet (or prophets), at Thessalonica, perhaps even claiming Pauline authority. If it was a prophecy it could be in the form of a future prophecy, assuming Day of the Lord refers, in their minds, to something future, Acts 11:27; 21:11 or else the kind of exhortatory prophecy found in Acts 15:32; cf. 19:6.

It is extremely difficult to know the precise meaning of the word. Another possibility is that 'spirit' stands for another of the gifts, the gift of λόγος σοφίας or γνώσεως, I Cor. 12:8<sup>147</sup>. If so λόγου and ἐπιστολῆς would have the meaning 'oral' and 'written'. An alternative suggestion is to connect πνεῦμα with ἀποκαλύψις and understand it as being the uttering of a new truth, whilst referring προφητεία to Spirit-inspired exposition of apostolic truth. This is unlikely in view of the references in Acts. A better idea would be to relate πνεῦμα with πνευμάτων, I Cor. 12:10. This is a gift used by the church to decide between true and false spirits. Lietzmann-Kümmel write,

Die Gabe zu erkennen, ob es der göttliche oder menschliche oder ein dämonischer Geist ist, <sup>der</sup> aus dem Verzückten spricht<sup>148</sup>.

I.5:20f. indicates a need in the church at Thessalonica to test the spirits, so perhaps Paul is referring to a spirit, true or false, depending on how he regarded it. There is evidence in the O.T. and N.T. for false spirits attempting to speak in God's name, I Kings 22:19-23; Judges 9:23; Ezek. 14:9; I Cor. 12:3,10; II Cor. 11:4; I Jn. 4:1. If it refers to a lying spirit, human or demonic, Paul is clearly stigmatising the means.

The only real alternative to this last suggestion suffers from certain drawbacks. If 'spirit' stands for prophecy, why did Paul not use the latter word? The only answer can be that πνεῦμα really stands for The Holy Spirit<sup>149</sup>, but because of its parallelism with 'word' and



'epistle' Paul intends us to understand 'prophecy': a very circuitous route!<sup>150</sup> In other references where  $\delta\iota\alpha$  and  $\piνευμα$  are used together we either have the article or  $\alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$  to indicate the Spirit Acts 1:2; Rom. 5:5; II Tim. 1:14; Tit. 3:5. It is significant that in I Cor. 12:10 'spirit' is anarthrous and unqualified<sup>151</sup>, as II.2:2. In II Cor. 11:4  $\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$  is attached to  $\piνευμα$ , which is also anarthrous, and in both Corinthian passages lying spirits are referred to<sup>152</sup>. In addition to which, wherever the Spirit is mentioned in Thessalonians the article is used, I.4:8; 5:19 or defined by another word, I.1:5,6; 4:8; II.2:13.

We conclude therefore, that the use of the anarthrous substantive points to a false and lying spirit through which the statement was made. As B. Weiss comments

Es konnte jenes geschehen durch einen Geist, der sie treibt, aber auch statt des göttlichen ein dämonischer Geist sein kann (cf. I.5:21), oder ...<sup>153</sup>.

#### B. Word

$\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$  is generally understood to be an 'utterance' of one sort or another<sup>154</sup>. This will probably mean  $\delta\iota\epsilon\alpha\chi\eta$  in contrast to 'inspired utterances', or else 'oral' as opposed to 'written'. If, as we have argued,  $\piνευμα$  refers to a false spirit, it ( $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ ) could be a prophetic word. The word is again anarthrous and as it is in parallel with two other such nouns, it is also likely it carries the idea of false.

C. Epistle

It is difficult to know to what letter Paul refers. Did Paul even know about such a letter (and for that matter, 'spirit' and 'word'), or was he supposing the means by which he expected the error to spread? At this point it becomes necessary to enquire into the meaning of the phrase

ὡς δι' ἡμῶν, which is clearly attached to ἐπιστολή<sup>155</sup>.

(a) It can be translated 'as through us' and mean 'coming through us'<sup>156</sup>. This understanding of the phrase lays the emphasis on the δι'. When specifically applied to the letter it means, 'as written through us'. The 'through us' might indicate i) source or ii) authority. This view could support the suggestion that we have a reference to I. It could be further urged that the teaching of I.4:13-5:12 had been misunderstood by the readers, but the arguments against this are very strong. They must have badly misunderstood I.4:13ff, which itself was clarifying a very real problem. In the light of that section how could they assert the Parousia was here? On our understanding of the error as 'present salvation' this argument would not apply. They might well have appealed to this letter for support. Next, we would expect the preposition ὑπό or παρά to be used if Paul was affirming the Letter to be his. So in Josephus, Ant. xviii.234, ἐπιστολαί τε ἀφ' ἑκόντο παρὰ τοῦ Γαίου. In 2:2 the δι' must have the meaning 'through' (au moyen de)<sup>157</sup> and not 'von' as Bornemann, Staab and De Boor.

Finally it is strange that all three nouns are anarthrous, and especially ἐπιστολή, if it refers to

I Thessalonians, cf. I Cor. 5:9, τῇ ἐπιστολῇ = a previous letter. It appears that by not using the article Paul was stressing the indefiniteness of the means; it is through a letter.

(b) A second view concentrates on and takes ὡς = 'as', with the context lending the notion of doubt. We can translate, 'as if' or 'purporting to be'. This seems a more suitable view, with the δι' referring either to i) Paul and his companions as the source or ii) their authority for the issue of a letter. According to Askwith δι' emphasises the means (authority) rather than source<sup>158</sup>. He connects the phrase to the rather distant verbs and translates, 'as if we had given any sanction to these disturbing views'. If however we take his meaning with δι' ἐπιστολῆς as is more likely, the Apostle is saying, 'or through a letter, as if we had sanctioned it'. Grayston has said that it could well be a reference to a false letter with Paul's so-called authority<sup>159</sup>. It would be in such a letter that some members claimed ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου assuming of course, that Paul knew of such a letter!

(c) Frame has a modification of the last view<sup>160</sup>. He suggests the phrase means, 'as if said by us' and, is connected to all three-prepositional means but refers to the cause of the unsettlement; the Day of the Lord has come. This is very similar to Askwith's view. On Frame's view the passage runs 'through a spirit, a word or letter as if we sanctioned (authorised) the statement which appears through the three means, that is, the Day of the Lord has come'.

Most scholars attach the phrase not only to 'epistle' but 'word' and/or 'spirit'. Those who attach it to all three are Lightfoot, Milligan, von Dobschütz, Frame, Dibelius, Adeney, Bicknell, Rigaux, Masson and Best. The usual reason for this is the parallelism of the three means and their apparent unity, cf. the triple *μήτε*. Those who attach it to 'word and epistle' are Theodoret, Lünemann, Ellicott, Eadie, Bornemann, Schmiedel, Staab, Schlatter, and De Boor. The usual objections to the inclusion of *πνεῦμα* is that it is going on at the time of the writing of II so Paul cannot be associated with it. For the association of the two elsewhere, see II.2:15, *εἴτε διὰ λόγου εἴτε δι' ἐπιστολῆς ἡμῶν*. If a participle of *γράφω* is used to complete the clause, then the phrase can only refer to 'epistle', B. Weiss, Moffat, Blass-Debrunner.

Each commentator makes his own suppositions about the way in which the error was spread. There has been too much emphasis, perhaps, on *διὰ* as source (by) rather than authority (through). It appears to us that certain believers were claiming authority for their views. Did Paul know personally of the three 'means'? Whether he did or not we can only guess. Lünemann and Bornemann think he knew of prophetic statements but most commentators think Paul only supposed possible methods. He certainly had a report of what some people believed and it is likely it would contain some information about the means. However the Apostle leaves nothing to chance as v.3a clearly shows, and it is to this that we now turn.

Most commentators read  $\mu\eta \dots \tau\rho\acute{o}\pi\omicron\nu$  as an independent clause<sup>161</sup>. B. Weiss and Wohlenberg both consider it is connected with  $\epsilon\rho\omega\tau\acute{\alpha}\omega$ , v.1, and introduces the content of the request<sup>162</sup>. This is unlikely. Alternatively we could place a comma after v.2 and treat the  $\mu\eta$  as one of apprehension, 'fearing lest'. But this is unnecessary. The independent clause follows on quite naturally. Paul now widens the scope to include all possible means of deception which may be used.

The warning of v.3a recalls that found in the Synoptic Apocalypse, Mt. 24:4 = Mk. 13:5,  $\beta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\tau\epsilon \mu\eta \tau\iota\varsigma \upsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \pi\lambda\alpha\nu\acute{\eta}\sigma\eta$ . We have already noted similarities in the previous two verses, and in particular the Matthean tradition. This may well indicate that both go back to a nucleus of primitive Christian teaching on the subject of the Parousia and warnings against deception<sup>163</sup>. But in each case the material is applied differently. The warning is against means of deception (perhaps supporting the fact that Paul's authority was attached to various means), rather than a person or persons (as in the Synoptic Apocalypse).

We also have a different verb in Paul  $\epsilon\varsigma\alpha\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\omega$ <sup>164</sup>. This might suggest a different translation of an Aramaic original if it arose from catechetical teaching.  $\Pi\lambda\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\omega$  is frequent in the N.T. and occurs in the Pauline writings, I Cor. 6:9; 15:33; Gal. 6:7; cf. II Tim. 3:13; Tit. 3:3. We might well have expected here,  $\mu\eta \pi\lambda\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\epsilon$ . The verb (in 2:2), which is found only in Pauline writings, Rom. 7:11; 16:18; I Cor. 3:18; II Cor. 11:3; cf. I Tim. 2:14,



may have been used because a particular emphasis and idea suggested themselves to Paul's mind. The verb is found twice in the LXX. In Ex. 8:25 the B Text reads  $\mu\eta$  προσθῆς ἔτι φαρᾶω, ἐξαπατήσαι (A. ἀπατήσαι) τοῦ  $\mu\eta$  ξεασκοστεῖλαι τὸν λαὸν θῦσαι κυρίῳ. Coupled with an element of mockery, Pharaoh actively deceives God's people<sup>165</sup>. In Dan. Sus. 5:6 (Theod.) τὸ κάλλος ἐξαπάτησέν σε (LXX, ἡπάτησεν), 'Beauty blinds you and so deceives you'<sup>166</sup>. In Rom. 7:11; 16:18 and I Cor. 3:18<sup>167</sup> we have the thought of deluding. In II Cor. 11:3 emphasis is either on the serpent's deception or Eve as the one deluded, cf. I Tim. 2:14 v.l. ἀπατάω. The latter seems preferable, cf. I Eph. 8:1; I Rom. 6:2. The idea which emerges is that of a delusion<sup>168</sup> which may affect members of the community (cf. 2:2).

Each time the word is used by Paul it is associated with a spoken word or unexpressed thought. The words of Rom. 16:18 are in effect a commentary on II.2:3. The Apostle warns against those who, by using smooth and fair speech, promote teaching contrary to primitive doctrine and delude innocent members. The bruising of Satan, Rom. 16:20; cf. Gen. 3:15, is probably to be understood as the suppression of erroneous views. Satan is mentioned because he is author of schisms. Genesis 3 features again in II Cor. 11:3 and no doubt underlies Rom. 7:11 'Sin deluded me and slew me' (cf. 'The serpent deceived me', Gen. 3:13)<sup>169</sup>. Can we seek a background from Gen. 3 for I Cor. 3:18 and II.2:3? In the first passage the wise are inclined to self-exaltation and pride, 'If any man thinks he is wise among you ...'.



This is reminiscent of the temptation facing the pair in Eden, Gen. 3:5, to be as gods (or God). The same theme is present in Thessalonians. The Anomos exalts himself and aspires to God's place. This is based on Dan. 11:36 but finds a parallel in Genesis. In fact II.2 not only reflects the idea of Holy War<sup>170</sup>, but the attempt of a man to be anti (instead of) God. In Gen. 3 the first attempt is depicted; here in II.2 the last of many attempts is outlined. In both cases the Devil, in Paul's view, initiates and gives the power to deceive, through a serpent, II Cor. 11:3, and his Anomos, II.2:9f.

We would suggest therefore that Paul has chosen this word because of its association with the Fall, or that in pre-Pauline tradition this word is used for the same reason. This in no way excludes the view that the warning goes back to an translation of an Aramaic original, only that this word has been chosen in translation to recall the First Temptation. To the Thessalonians the word would convey the meaning delusion, but to Paul it would have greater overtones. 'Do not be deluded, as has happened, and will happen'.

But the Apostle has not finished. The community are not to be 'deluded in any way',<sup>171</sup>. It was the serpent in Gen. 3; it will be the Anomos in the future. The phrase *κατὰ πᾶσαν τῶν τρόπων* is a well-known current expression according to Milligan<sup>172</sup>. If so Paul is using an idiomatic phrase to cover all possible ways of deception<sup>173</sup>. Of what are they not to be deluded? Paul begins with *ὅτι* but fails to complete the apodosis. However we are not left in much doubt as to what Paul intended. Either it was the

expression in 2:2c or something very similar, ἡ ἡμέρα  
 οὐκ ἐνφωτίζεται <sup>174</sup>. Ellipses are very common in  
 Paul, Gal. 1:20; 2:4,9; I Cor. 1:31; II Cor. 8:13;  
 Rom. 4:16. Having given the general warning he now pro-  
 ceeds to deal with the eschatological themes which will  
 show that the Day has not come.

<sup>1</sup>Bl-Deb. para. 447 (1). For the adversative sense I Cor. 2:15 and the transitive Rom. 8:28; I Cor. 16:12,17; Gal. 3:23.

<sup>2</sup>Masson, ad loc. has mais believing there is every reason to choose the adversative; so too Dibelius and A. Schlatter, Der Briefe an die Thessalonicher, Philipper, Timotheus and Titus, Stuttgart, 1950, both ad loc., G.G. Findlay, The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Thessalonians (C.G.T.), Cambridge, 1925, sees the contrast between the certainty and blessedness of the Parousia (II.1:5ff.) and the state of disquiet into which the church might fall. Obviously we cannot omit the idea of transition, 'now then' from the δέ as recognised by the older commentators, J. Eadie, Commentary on the Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians, London, 1877, and H. Alford, The Greek Testament (rev. by E.F. Harrison, Vols. III and IV), Chicago, 1958, ad loc.

<sup>3</sup>Von Dobschütz citing I.2:17, Frame, Rigaux opt for a transitive sense. The danger is that it can easily give way to J.B. Lightfoot's assertion that the Apostle turns aside to correct any mistakes and calm feverish desires, Notes on Epistles of St. Paul, London, 1904. This gives the distinct impression that 2:1ff. is a parathensis, whereas nearly all commentators hold that it gives the main point of the letter e.g., Schmiedel, p. 37, von Dobschütz, p. 260. and Neil, (Moffat), p. 155. The adversative tends to guarantee this.

<sup>4</sup>This may be another instance of the formula found in hellenistic Greek according to Bjerkelund, op. cit., pp. 13ff., 136ff. The formula consists of the verb in the first person, an address (brothers) a pre-positional phrase (sometimes), a request or command introduced often by ἵνα or an infinitive. He cites as Pauline examples, Rom. 12:1-2; 15:30-32; I.4:1, 10-12; 5:14 et al. Bjerkelund regards παρακαλέω and ἑρωτάω as synonymous, with the former in the formula meaning 'request'. In his survey he finds this form of address binds the writer and reader together and is diplomatic in its approach. It often follows a thanksgiving. Against this for II.2:1ff. is the following:

- (1) it precedes the thanksgiving, 2:13-17
- (2) it is differently phrased with ὅτι and εἰς τὸ clauses
- (3) ἑρωτάω is rare in Paul and is probably not to be regarded as synonymous with παρακαλέω.

Of course it may be that in II.2:1 Paul has used the formula loosely. Bjerkelund cites Pauline texts where the typical construction is not found but are related to parakaleō clauses, cf. II Cor. 2:8; 6:1; Gal. 4:12; Phil. 4:2ff.; I.5:27; Phlm. 9-12.

<sup>5</sup>For word studies, Bauer, s.v., ἑρωτάω and H. Greeven, 'ἑρωτάω' in T.D.N.T., II, p. 685-687. For ἐπερωτάω in Paul, Rom. 10:20 (Is. 65:1); 1 Cor. 14:35.

<sup>6</sup>This sense is found only in the Gospels, Mt. 21:24 = Lk. 20:3; Mk. 4:10; cf. Gen. 24:47, καὶ ἡρώτησα αὐτὴν καὶ εἶπα τίς ἐστι θυγάτηρ.

<sup>7</sup>A. Deissmann, Bible Studies (transl. by A. Grieve), Edinburgh, 1903, pp. 195f., 290f. idem, Light from the Ancient East (transl. by L.R.M. Strachan), London, 1927, pp. 179, 193 and G. Milligan, St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians, London, 1908, p. 46.

<sup>8</sup>Findlay, p. 80, Rigaux, p. 496, writes, "Pour des Sémites, comme Paul, le substrat  $\lambda\alpha\omega$  l'y predisposait"

<sup>9</sup>For παρακαλέω and ἐρωτάω together in the Papyri see P. Oxy 294. 28f. (1st cen. A.D.); 744.6f. (1st cen. B.C.). Moulton-Milligan note its extended use in Christian prayers. For examples of παρακαλέω, I.3:2; 4:10; Rom. 15:30; 16:17; I Cor. 1:10; 16:15, cf. Frame, p. 244.

<sup>10</sup>Lightfoot and Milligan, ad loc.

<sup>11</sup>Findlay, p. 80. De Boor says that the matter is so important the Apostle must request his readers, ad loc.

<sup>12</sup>Frame, ad loc. argues that the request is to the faint-hearted in the community, but there is no hint of this in the text.

<sup>13</sup>ὑπέρ see Bauer and H. Riesenfeld, 'ὑπέρ' in T.D.N.T., VIII, pp. 507-516.

<sup>14</sup>vulgate has the adjectival per. Cf. too J. Calvin, The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians (transl. by R. Mackenzie), Edinburgh, 1961, ad loc. For an example of the sense, Hom. Il. 24. 444d, καὶ μὴν ὑπὲρ πατρὸς καὶ μητέρος ἡυκόμοιο.

<sup>15</sup>J.H. Moulton, A Grammar of New Testament Greek, 3rd edn., Edinburgh, 1919, p. 105.

<sup>16</sup>Other examples in Moulton-Milligan, p. 651.

<sup>17</sup>Under περί l. (f). Also, Bl.-Deb. para. 229 (1) who cite Mt. 26:28 (D has ὑπέρ); I Cor. 1:13 etc. For papyri examples, Moulton-Milligan, p. 504. The two texts cited are late 4th cen. A.D.

<sup>18</sup>Para. 231 (1).

<sup>19</sup>P. 270.

<sup>20</sup>P. 65, s.v. ii. (c), 'concerning'.

<sup>21</sup>Υπέρ , l.d.

<sup>22</sup>Υπέρ , l.f.

<sup>23</sup>Bauer adds a series of texts from II Cor. 1:8 (v.l. περί ); 5:12; 7:4,14; 8:24; 9:2f.; 12:5a,b. All except the first depend on καὶ χάρις, καὶ ἡ γὰρ or καὶ χάρις.

<sup>24</sup>Chrysostom, Calvin, Bornemann, Milligan, Dibelius, Staab, Schlatter, Riesenfeld, op. cit., Rigaux, all ad loc.

<sup>25</sup>Ad loc. Also G. Lünemann, Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament: The Epistles to the Thessalonians (transl. by P. J. Gloag from the 3rd edn. Meyer), Edinburgh, 1880, Schmiedel, Bornemann, Wohlenberg, Milligan, Findlay, all ad loc. Rigaux, ad loc., takes it as equivalent to περί citing I.3:9; Rom. 9:27; I Cor. 4:6; II Cor. 4:12; 8:23.

<sup>26</sup>Ad loc. Rigaux, ad loc. reads ὅπερ for περί even though he notes that we must let the context recommend the sense.

<sup>27</sup>We do not doubt that the two prepositions are interchanged in Koinē Greek, but that does not imply a particular writer has done so.

<sup>28</sup>Findlay, citing I.3:2; II Cor. 1:6 (cf. Moule, p. 65 2(b) = 'with a view to', but he adds that it is hard to separate this meaning from that of 'for the sake of') 13:8; Phil. 2:13; C.J. Ellicott, Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians, London, 1858, Lünemann, B. Weiss, Die Paulinischen Briefe, Leipzig, 1896, 'Im Interesse', L. Morris, The Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians (Tyndale), London, 1956, all ad loc.

<sup>29</sup>For this sense but not in our passage, Riesenfeld, op. cit., T.W.N.T., VIII, pp. 511ff. = T.D.N.T., VIII, pp. 508ff. Mk. 9:40; Rom. 8:31; Phil. 1:7; 4:10.

<sup>30</sup>Examples from Bauer, s.v. ὅπερ , l.b.



<sup>31</sup>E.D. Burton, The Epistle to the Galatians (I.C.C.) Edinburgh, 1921, pp. 12f. On Gal. 1:4 he argues that in view of the abstract noun (sins), the ὑπέρ must be modified. We should translate therefore 'to deliver from'. He considers the reading ὑπέρ p<sup>51</sup> B H 33 pm. intrinsically more probable than περί, p<sup>46</sup> א\* A D G al. See too H. Lietzmann, An die Galater, (H.Z.N.T., 2nd edn.), Tübingen, 1923, p.4 who has um willen. H. Schlier, Der Brief an die Galater, (Meyer, 13th edn.), Göttingen, 1965, p. 32 takes the preposition in the sense of περί.

<sup>32</sup>Lünemann, ad loc. writes, 'we entreat you in the interest of the advent, namely to guard it against all misrepresentations, not to deviate from the correct view concerning it'. This is a rather lengthy understanding of a single preposition, but it conveys the sentiment behind it.

<sup>33</sup>= Mk. 1:30 λέγουσιν αὐτῷ περὶ αὐτῆς.

<sup>34</sup>Similarly βασιλεία and εὐαγγέλιον are united by a single article, I.2:12. See too Bl.-Deb. para. 276 (1), Lk. 1:6; 14:23; Mk. 12:33.

<sup>35</sup>Rigaux, p. 201 and Hartman op. cit., p. 195. Moulton-Milligan, s.v. παρουσία and H.K. McArthur 'Parousia' in I.D.B., III, p. 659 regard παρουσία as quasi-technical in the N.T., whilst Oepke, 'παρουσία' in T.D.N.T., V. p. 868f. says it has no technical significance for Paul and there is only a suggestion of it in II Pet. 3:12. The second term has more claim to be regarded as technical since it so rarely occurs in biblical writings and when it does it is often used in an apocalyptic context.

<sup>36</sup>Lünemann, Wohlenberg, de Boor ad loc.

<sup>37</sup>For word studies, Bauer, s.v. παρουσία W.A. Brown, 'Parousia' in H.D.B., III, pp. 674-680, A. Deissman, LAE, pp. 368ff., McArthur, I.D.B., III, p. 658f., Milligan, pp. 145-147, Oepke, T.D.N.T., V, pp. 858-871, Rigaux, pp. 196-201. For Koine references Moulton-Milligan. On the subject of the Parousia A.L. Moore, The Parousia in the New Testament (N.T. Suppl., 13), Leiden, 1966.

<sup>38</sup>Rigaux, p. 200.

<sup>39</sup>Moulton-Milligan, p. 497.

<sup>40</sup>P. Tebt. 48.13f. (2nd cent. B.C.): Extra levy is imposed πρὸς τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως παρουσίαν. P. Par. 26.1.18 (B.C. 163/2): The Parousia of Philometer and Cleopatra.



<sup>41</sup>Milligan, p. 146.

<sup>42</sup>Rigaux, p. 199.

<sup>43</sup>Rigaux, p. 167, 'Apparition d'une Divinité, surtout dans les oracles et des mystères pour exercer une influence, porter une assistance'. He makes liberal use of material gathered by P.L. Schoonheim, Een semasiologisch onderzoek van Parousia met betrekking tot hetgebruik in Mattheus 24, Aalten, 1953.

<sup>44</sup>M. Dibelius-H. Conzelmann, Die Pastoralbriefe (H.Z.N.T.) Tübingen, 1966, pp. 74-77; K.H. Schelkle, Die Petrusbriefe. Der Judusbrieff (K.Z.N.T.), Freiburg, 1964, p. 32. Perhaps there is a link in II Pet. between the idea of  $\kappa\alpha\rho\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$  and  $\sigma\omega\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$ . Cf. II Pet. 1:11 with 1:14; 3:2-4 with 3:12-18.

<sup>45</sup>For the Jewish use of the word, Milligan, p. 146, von Dobschütz, pp. 127f. and Rigaux, *ibid.* The noun is found in Judth. 10:18; II Mac. 8:12; 15:21; III Mac. 3:7; T.Jud. 22:2; T.Lev. 8:15 (= presence), cf. Corpus Herm. II.22, 26a. A. Schlatter adduces many parallels from Josephus for the use of the word in respect of God's coming to the aid of his people on various occasions. e.g. Ant. i.168 ii.279 vi.273 xviii.284. He concludes that this arises from the frequent use of  $\kappa\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\iota$  and  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\kappa\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\iota$  for the saving presence of God, Der Evangelist Matthäus, Stuttgart, 1957, p. 695. If P. Volz, Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba, Tübingen-Leipzig, 1903, pp. 189f., is correct in assuming that  $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\kappa\omicron\pi\eta$  ( $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\kappa\epsilon\pi\tau\omicron\rho\alpha\iota$ ) is the technical term for the coming of God in Judaism, 1 En. 25:3; T.Lev. 16:5; T.Jud. 23:5; As.Mos. 1:18; Wis. 3:7; Ps.Sol. 3:14; 10:5; 15:14; 4 Ezra 5:56; II Bar. 20:2; 24:14; 83:2 cf. C.D. (  $\tau\pi\theta$  ) 1:7; 7:9; 1QH 1:17; 13:10 and in the N.T. Lk. 19:44; Acts 1:20 (Ps. 109:8); 1 Tim. 3:1; 1 Pet. 2:12), This adds further weight to the argument that  $\kappa\alpha\rho\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha$  has been deliberately borrowed because of its technical use in Hellenism.

<sup>46</sup>See Rigaux, p. 201.

<sup>47</sup>Cf. Phil. 2:12; Ep.Dioq.  $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\ \delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\rho\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \delta\epsilon\iota\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ .

<sup>48</sup>See chp. 6.259ff.

<sup>49</sup>See chp. 6.203ff.

<sup>50</sup>Parousia is used again in an apocalyptic setting in Mt. 24:3, 27, 37, 39. The Gospel may have been written for Jewish-Christians (although recently this has been denied see Kümmel, Introduction, pp. 79ff.), in which case Jewish readers would have no difficulty understanding it as the final coming of the Messiah. The same applies to Jms. 5:7, 8. It is interesting that the word is used for the first advent in II Pet. 1:16 and then applied to the End-time, 3:4, 12. This may indicate that the writer is only using the word in a general sense and not as a technical term. I indicates that the church consisted of many converted from a pagan background, 1:9f. This is re-inforced if  $\sigma\epsilon\beta\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\nu$  καὶ Ἑλλήνων is read with A D pc and a few old lat. MSS. and vg. (As Rigaux, p. 21 n.4 and W.M. Ramsay have argued, St. Paul, the Traveller and the Roman Citizen, London, 1895, pp. 235f. C. Edson, 'Cults of Thessalonica (Macedonica III)', H.T.R. 41 (1948) 153-204 has supplied ample evidence for the multiplicity of religious cults in the pagan society of Thessalonica. On specific religions in the area, F. Dunand, Le culte d'Isis dans le bassin oriental de la Méditerranée, Vol. II, Leiden, 1973, pp. 46-52 on Thessaly. W. Hornbostel Sarapis, Leiden, notes a Serapeum at Thessalonica, pp. 219 n.1, 325 and in G.J.F. Kater-Sibbes, Preliminary Catalogue of Sarapis Monuments, Leiden, 1973, p. 90 with various sculptures including Sarapis and Isis. On 'Hellenistic Thessalonika', M.J. Vickers, J.H.S. 92 (1972) 156-170. This article is mainly concerned with the layout and planning of the city. Further note on the Serapeum, p. 165.

<sup>51</sup>It is surely significant that only in I Cor. 15:23 does the Apostle again use the word for the coming of Christ. Otherwise it has the sense of 'visit' or 'presence'. Perhaps his experience with the use of the term at Thessalonica taught him to adopt more Jewish-Christian expressions, such as 'Day of Christ', 'Day of the Lord' etc. See I Cor. 5:5; II Cor. 1:14; Phil. 1:14; Phil. 1:6; Rom. 2:16.

<sup>52</sup>B. Weiss, ad loc., das betont gestellte ἥρῳν.

<sup>53</sup>ⲭ\* pc sy<sup>s</sup> bo<sup>pt</sup> have the singular as in Mk. 13:27.

<sup>54</sup>Cf. Did. 10:5 καὶ σύναξον αὐτὴν ἀπὸ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων.

<sup>55</sup>The 'Communion Service' also points forward to the eschatological event. I Cor. 11:26, ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ.

<sup>56</sup>For Jewish ideas, Volz, op. cit., pp. 309-312. W. Bousset-H. Gressmann, Die Religion des Judentums (H.Z.N.T., 3rd edn.), Tübingen, 1966, pp. 236ff. On p. 237 they write, "Diese Hoffnung auf die Heimkehr ist so festgeprägt, dass sie selbst in die christliche Apokalyptik übergegangen".

<sup>57</sup>See further Is. 43:5; 49:12; Zech. 8:7; 10:6.

<sup>58</sup>R.H. Charles, The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Oxford, 1908, p. 146.

<sup>59</sup>See also Tob. 13:13; I Bar. 4:36 - 5:9.

<sup>60</sup>Ellicot, ad loc. noted sometime ago that this phrase indicates 'the point to be reached'. No doubt the ἐπὶ (instead of πρὸς) is due to the preceding noun, Rigaux, ad loc. cf. Mk. 5:21 ὄχλος, πολὺς ἐπ' αὐτὸν (D Θ al have πρὸς); Jn. 19:33 ἐπὶ δὲ τὸν ἴσθμον ἐλθόντες. See further Bauer, s.v. ἐπὶ III.1.a. (y). The Vulgate reads eis perhaps suggested by the same preposition in I.4:17; cf. I.4:14 ἄξει σὺν αὐτῷ. It is incorrect to translate 'mit ihm', Dibelius, or 'empor zu ihm', Bornemann, both ad loc.

It is just possible that we could translate ἐπ' αὐτὸν by 'before him', E.J. Bicknell, The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians (Westminster Commentary), London, 1932, p. 72. Bauer gives examples of this (ibid.). This sense, though, only emerges when associated with the language of the law-courts. This is not apparent in II.2:1 so we are left with 'to him' which, as von Dobschütz says, lays the stress on the union with the Lord rather than the actual gathering together.

<sup>61</sup>This may be the thought of the author of Ps. Sol. 17:26, 'and he shall gather together a holy people, whom he shall lead in righteousness'. If 17:44 is a further comment on this, 'the gathering together of the tribes', then the emphasis falls on regrouping in Palestine. Those who fled the assemblies, 17:16ff., may be seen as part of the regathering, cf. 11:1ff. and J. Viteau, Les Psaumes de Salomon, Paris, 1911, p.354. A description of an End-time gathering appears in Rev. 7:9ff. where the stress is again on worship, the centrality of the Lamb and the blessedness of the new life.

<sup>62</sup>Von Dobschütz makes the point that we do not have a discourse on the union of believers and only incidentally on the Parousia, p. 264. He says it could be set out as 'von Antichrist und seiner Hinderung'.

<sup>63</sup>It is difficult to see how any who had read I.4:13ff. could actually misunderstand the teaching on the Parousia and the events associated with it.

<sup>64</sup>For an analysis and criticism of this view as expressed by Bornemann, von Dobschütz, Frame, and Rigaux, see Giblin, pp. 24-34, cf. for the view Neil, (Moffatt), p. 155, Oepke, p. 151; Staab, p. 50 and Best, p. 280f.

<sup>65</sup>As far as we know the Thessalonians had only received written statements about the Parousia and ἀκρόντης. Surely Lünemann is not far wrong when he asserts that this (2:1ff.) is a dogmatic section and not merely pastoral, p. 202.

<sup>66</sup>Although 1 Cor. 15 is dealing with a different error, and there are hints of a wilful intent to undermine the resurrection belief, 15:12, Paul reveals a similar approach in the way he deals with the problem. He uses various ideas to establish the certainty of the event and at the same time outline the nature of the resurrection body e.g. the resurrection of Christ, 15:20ff., baptism for the dead, 15:29, the seed analogy, 15:35ff. and the earthly and heavenly man 15:45ff. He also seems to move away from the fact of the resurrection when he describes the overthrow of Death and the establishment of the absolute sovereignty of God, 15:24ff. It appears a parenthesis as does II.2:3ff. In fact it is an integral part of the argument since it highlights why the resurrection is so important. Death, the obstacle, standing in the way of God's reign, will be destroyed by the resurrection, so that 'God may be all in all'.

<sup>67</sup>For his view, pp. 244-249. The quotation is from p. 34.

<sup>68</sup>P. 34.

<sup>69</sup>See his paraphrase of II.2:1ff., p. 30.

<sup>70</sup>P. 31.

<sup>71</sup>Pp. 32.

<sup>72</sup>Dibelius, 3rd edn., p. 49.

<sup>73</sup>Pp. 122-131.

<sup>74</sup>P. 244.

<sup>75</sup>Bl.-Deb. para. 402 (2); Moulton-Turner, p. 140ff.; A. Oepke, 'εἰς' in T.D.N.T., II, pp. 420-442, 430f.

<sup>76</sup>Bl.-Deb. para. 400 under 'The Genitive of the Articular Infinitive'.

<sup>77</sup>Moule, pp. 142f. However according to Moulton-Turner, p. 143 εἰς τὸ + the infinitive in Paul hardly expresses anything but purpose, cf. Rom. 12:3; I.2:16; 3:5; Phil. 1:10, but he does go on to say that the phrase may express "tendency, measure of, effect, or result".



See too Bauer, S.V. εἰς, 4.e p. 228. who cites Rom. 1:20; 3:26; I.3:13 for 'consequence'.

<sup>78</sup>As von Dobschütz, Rigaux and Best, ad loc. cf. Oecomenius τὸ δὲ ἐρωτῶμεν ὑμᾶς ... εἰς τὸ πῃ ταχέως, φησὶ κ.τ.λ.

<sup>79</sup>Schmiedel, Bornemann and Findlay, ad loc.

<sup>80</sup>Ibid. 1 para 400 (2). In para. 392 (1).c, examples are given of ἵνα and ὅπως after ἐρωτῶμεν, but they are all taken from the Gospels or Acts.

<sup>81</sup>p. 143.

<sup>82</sup>There is no verb of asking in this last reference. For the Greek see at the end of point (c) in the text of the thesis.

<sup>83</sup>p. 649.

<sup>84</sup>A. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament, London, 1914, p. 1072.

<sup>85</sup>B. Weiss; Wohlenberg; W.F. Adeney Thessalonians and Galatians (Cen.B.), Edinburgh, n.d., all ad loc. give the phrase final force. Wohlenberg translates 'auf das nicht', but goes on to make v.3a the object of the request. This seems too far away from ἐρωτῶμεν, v.1. Frame comments that his view is smoother but less Pauline.

<sup>86</sup>For a good example of the consecutive sense, Rom. 1:20. It is just possible that we have an epexegetical construction (cf. Phil. 3:21 and for the explanatory infinitive Bl.-Deb. para. 394) and can translate, as Moule suggests p. 129, 'We beseech you to safeguard the Parousia, that is not to be shaken from your mind'.

<sup>87</sup>E.g. Lightfoot, Milligan, Rigaux and Best, all ad loc. Cf. Gal. 1:6; 1 Tim. 5:22. Burton, op. cit., p. 19, says ταχέως can be taken temporally (cf. I Cor. 4:19; Phil. 2:19,24 etc.) as the brevity of the interval rather than the rapidity of the process is in view. H. Schlier, op. cit., p. 36 disagrees. It is not easy to decide for the references mentioned. Either sense can suit and in II.2:2 it does not materially affect our understanding of the passage.

<sup>88</sup>P. 205.

<sup>89</sup>Bauer s.v. σαλεύω, von Dobschütz, p. 264; Frame, p. 245 and Rigaux, p. 748 deal with the use and meaning of the word.

<sup>90</sup>J.W. Bailey, 'The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians', in I.B. p. 325 over-generalises when he says it always implies a violent unsettling.

<sup>91</sup>Σαλεύω may be virtually equivalent to ταραύω (H. Conzelmann, Die Apostelgeschichte (H.Z.N.T.) Tübingen, 1963, p. 94) with which it is associated, or else mean 'stir up to rebellion' leaving ταραύω to relate to some mental disturbance.

<sup>92</sup>P.109, followed by Milligan and Frame, ad loc.

<sup>93</sup>P.164.

<sup>94</sup>Σαλεύω is in parallel with σείω, Job 9:6; Nah. 1:5; Hab. 2:16 or similar word Is. 33:20; I Mac. 9:13. In II.2:2 Bornemann, pp. 134f. von Dobschütz, pp. 133f. and Rigaux, p. 470, give the verb the sense of be disturbed, agitated.

<sup>95</sup>Bornemann, p.360; cf. II.1:9, ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Κυρίου and Rom. 7:2; 9:3. See Bl.-Deb. para. 211, The Genitive of Separation or Alienation.

<sup>96</sup>Cf. W.D. Stacey, The Pauline View of Man, London, 1956, pp. 198ff. Paul borrows a Greek word and gives it the meaning 'reflective consciousness', 1 Cor. 14:14. He objects to νοῦς = faculty of reasoning even though he uses the term 'faculty' (for testing), p.201. Recently R. Jewett, Paul's Anthropological Terms (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, 10), Leiden, 1971, pp. 358-373 has given a review of literature on the subject. His own view is that in II.2:2 over against enthusiasts who believed they had achieved an immortal state (and were shocked by the death of some members), had given up their daily work (I.4:11f.; II.3:11) and tended to libertinism (I.4:1ff., pp. 17,369), Paul urges a proper mental attitude. At this point Jewett becomes vague about defining the term (p.373) and we doubt his conclusion that νοῦς (νοῦς τετέω) in Thess. Phil. and Cor. B (I Cor. 1:10; 2:16; 14:14; 15:9) is used in anti-enthusiastic settings (p.450). For the opponents seen as 'enthusiasts' cf. H.-A. Egenwolf, 'The Second Epistle to the Thessalonians' in The Two Epistles to the Thessalonians (N.T. for Spiritual Reading), London, 1969, p.123, and Oepke, p.151.



<sup>97</sup>Cf. e.g. Weiss, Lightfoot, ad loc.; Vulgate, 'a sensu vestro'.

<sup>98</sup>So Best ad loc. translates 'sanity'.

<sup>99</sup>Moore, ad loc., 'power of sane judgment'.

<sup>100</sup>P.360.

<sup>101</sup>P.649. Cf. J. Behm, 'ἡ σοφία' in T.D.N.T., IV, pp. 951-960. He says there is no precise meaning for the term in the N.T. He cites I Cor. 14:14f. 19; II.2:2 under the heading of 'Understanding', but he all too easily glides from the sense of "sure power of judgment" into "discretion in the face of extravagant ideas".

<sup>102</sup>Ad loc. Cf. Adeney, ad loc., "your settled convictions" which made up their normal state of mind. Von Dobschütz rejects such ideas, pp. 264f.

<sup>103</sup>Mk. 13:7, D has θορυβεῖσθε ; in Lk. 24:37 for κτοηθέντες p<sup>75</sup> B 1241 have θρονηθέντες and α' W φοβηθέντες. Probably the α' and B readings are an attempt to tone down the original reading. Cf. the use of κτοηθήτε, Lk. 21:9 which deliberately heightens the effect which wars and rumours of wars will have upon the disciples of Christ.

<sup>104</sup>Wohlenberg, Milligan, von Dobschütz and Rigaux all ad loc.

<sup>105</sup>Bauer s.v. θροέω.

<sup>106</sup>See B.D.B. on ἡ ὀργή. 'murmur' (Cant. 5:4), 'growl', 'roar' and 'be boisterous'.

<sup>107</sup>Frame, ad loc.

<sup>108</sup>E. Klostermann, Das Markus-Evangelium (H.Z.N.T., 4th edn.), Tübingen, 1950, p.133; E. Lohmeyer-W. Schmauch, Das Evangelium des Matthäus (Meyer, 4th edn.), Göttingen, 1967, p.269.

<sup>109</sup>With Bauer, Milligan, Frame and others. Rigaux, p.649, Griblin, p.51 n.3 and Klostermann op. cit., (2nd edn., 1926), p.149 (but not in the 4th edn.) treat it as a middle.

<sup>110</sup>The clause is introduced by ὅτι ὅτι which does not imply any doubt about what Paul had heard, Moulton-

Turner, p.137, Bl.-Deb. para. 396 cf. II Cor. 11:21.

<sup>111</sup>For its use in the LXX see Rigaux, p.555.

<sup>112</sup>Von Dobschütz, p.204. He notes how, in the textual tradition, this appears to be offensive to copyists.

<sup>113</sup>See R. Bultmann, New Testament Theology (transl. by K. Grobel), London, 1952, I. pp. 75f.; M. Rist, 'Day of Christ' in I.D.B., I, p.783.

<sup>114</sup>Cf. A. Oepke, 'ἐνίστημι' in T.D.N.T., II, pp. 543-544. An earlier and excellent outline can be found in Eadie, pp. 259ff.

<sup>115</sup>καὶ πὸς τὸ ἐνεστῶς, a technical expression according to C. Spicq, 'L'Épître aux Hébreux, Apollos, Jean-Baptiste, Les Hellenistes et Qumran', R.Q.1 (1958/59) 365-390, p.376 n.64. He gives examples from the papyri.

<sup>116</sup>Frame, Findlay etc. ad loc.

<sup>117</sup>Moulton-Milligan, p.215.

<sup>118</sup>B.B. Warfield, 'The Prophecies of St. Paul. I-1 and 2 Thessalonians', Exp. III, 4, 30-44, p.37.

<sup>119</sup>Calvin, p.398f., B. Weiss, ad loc.

<sup>120</sup>Bauer, s.v. ἐνίστημι. According to Burton, op. cit., pp. 432f. the Present Middle of the verb can mean 'to impend, begin to threaten', in the Aorist 'threatened' but in the Perfect its proper force relates to an existing state.

<sup>121</sup>So S. Zeitlin translates, The Second Book of Maccabees, New York, 1954, p.141.

<sup>122</sup>Bauer, ibid.

<sup>123</sup>p.268.

<sup>124</sup>2nd edn., p.37.

<sup>125</sup>p.130.

<sup>126</sup>T.D.N.T., II, p.543. Cf. Schmiedel (citing I Cor. 7:36), p.37.

<sup>127</sup>P.653. Masson too, p.93 n.5.

<sup>128</sup>Frame, p.248; Bicknell p.74; Neil, (Moffatt), p.159; Morris, (Tyndale), pp. 125f. and Bailey, p.323.

<sup>129</sup>Rigaux argues the Parousia is more than 'arrival', it includes the attendant circumstances, p.201.

<sup>130</sup>G. von Rad, 'ἡμέρα' (O.T.) in T.D.N.T. II, pp. 943-947 rejects the view that 'Day of the Lord' stands for a calendar day because he equates 'the Day' with phrases such as 'the days to come' etc., p.946.

<sup>131</sup>See E. Jenni, 'Day of the Lord' in I.D.B., I pp. 784-785, "the impending decisive intervention of God in the prophetic anticipation of the future". See too A.B. Davidson, 'Eschatology' in H.D.B. I pp. 735-738, J. Bright, 'Day of the Lord' in H.D.B. (one vol. 2nd edn. ed. F.C. Grant, H.H. Rowley), Edinburgh, 1963, p.203.

<sup>132</sup>Joel 2:1; Is. 13:6,9; Jer. 46:10; Ezek. 30:2,3; Amos 5:18; Obad 15; Zeph. 1:14,15; Zech. 14:1. The use of 'Day' for the End appears throughout intertestamental literature, especially in a gentival <sup>phrase</sup> form. Day of consummation 1 En. 10:2; 16:1; of darkness, 94:9; of judgment, 10:12; 22:11; 84:4; 4 Ezra 7:38,39; Judth. 16:17; Jub. 4:19; 23:11; T.Lev. 3:3 (some MSS.); Ps.Sol. 15:12; of God, II Bar. 48:47; That Day, 1 En. 45:3f.; S.Or. III. 55f.; Cf. Volz, op. cit., pp. 188ff.; Bousset-Gressmann, op. cit., pp. 257ff.; Russell, op. cit., pp. 92ff. 272.

<sup>133</sup>See D.E.H. Whiteley, The Theology of St. Paul, Oxford, 1964, pp. 241ff., for a discussion and summary on this point. Rigaux, pp. 222-227 takes a middle course: Paul hoped for a near Parousia but was ignorant of the date.

<sup>134</sup>Bl.-Deb. deal with verbs of going (coming) which have the meaning 'to be in the process of going (coming)' for which the destination lies in the future.

<sup>135</sup>E.E. Ellis, The Gospel of Luke (N.Cen.B.) London, 1966, p.210 states that the Thessalonian Church harboured the error of a secret return. De Boor, on the idea of a partial-rapture, says those left behind would ask Why had Paul not been taken? It would be plain, we might add, that no one had gone!

<sup>136</sup>P.217.

<sup>137</sup>Cf. other Pauline references which might suggest to Christians that the Day of the Lord was present II. Cor. 6:2 (salvation's day is now); Gal. 4:4 (fulness of times); 1 Cor. 10:11 (end of the ages is here). See too Lk. 1:54,55; 2:29-32; Eph. 2:11-22; Heb. 9:11-22 which indicate the church's belief at various stages of its early history in the present application of salvation. Cf. J.W. Bowman 'Eschatology of the N.T.' in I.D.B., II, pp. 135-140; p.139, sect. b.

<sup>138</sup>See C.H. Dodd, 'Matthew and Paul' E.T. 48 (1946/47) 293-298, p.294, who understands 'the kingdom' to exist in this world during historical time (cf. in Mt. and Paul, Mt. 13:37ff.; 25:31ff.; 1 Cor. 15:23f.).

<sup>139</sup>Schmithals, Paulus u. die Gnostiker, pp. 146ff.

<sup>140</sup>Marxsen, Introduction, pp. 39,44 dating the letter after A.D. 70.

<sup>141</sup>M.L. Peel, 'Gnostic Eschatology and the New Testament', N.T. 12 (1970) 141-165.

<sup>142</sup>We reject a theory of 'realised eschatology' at this early stage of the church's life. For the view, Moore, pp. 98f. A.F.J. Klijn, An Introduction to the New Testament (transl. by M. van der Vathorst-Smit), Leiden, 1967, p.121. It is hard to conceive of the community rejecting all eschatological hope since it was an important part of missionary preaching, I.1:9f.; II.2:5. Cf. too Jewett's view, chp. 4, fn. 96.

<sup>143</sup>We cannot be sure that they did not deny or re-interpret the Parousia but if they had and Paul received reports about this we would have expected him to include the word alongside 'Day of the Lord'. He had had information relating to this expression.

The word was familiar to them and the way it was used by Christians to evoke the coming of Christ makes it hard to conceive that they would alter or reject its meaning. On the other hand 'Day of the Lord' has very definite foreign overtones for recently converted pagans. Moreover Paul had heard of problems with one expression (Day of the Lord), if problems existed with the word Parousia we might have expected that term to have been used in II.2:2c.

<sup>144</sup>For a summary of views on the precise problem of I Cor. 15, see J.H. Wilson, 'The Corinthians who say There is no resurrection of the Dead' Z.N.W. 59 (1968), 90-107 and Conzelmann, An die Kor., op. cit., pp. 308f. who suggests that Paul argues against people who only believe in a transformation of the living, not in the resurrection from the dead. Both Bultmann, Theology, op. cit., I, pp. 168f. and W. Schmithals,

Die Gnosis in Korinth: Eine Untersuchung zu den Korintherbriefen, Göttingen, 1956, p.74 consider Paul misunderstood the nature of the opposition-Gnosticism. Recently S. Arai, 'Die Gegner des Paulus im I Korintherbrief und das Problem der Gnosis, N.T.S. 19 (1972/73) 430-437 rejects Gnosticism because of an absence of key ideas. His own view, that Paul's opponents were wealthy intelligentsia, Gentiles Christians who thought the Psychic would be destroyed does not commend itself. R. McL. Wilson is cautious: we have the first tentative beginnings in Corinth of what later became full-scale Gnosticism, 'How Gnostic' were the Corinthians?', N.T.S. 19 (1972/73), 65-74.

<sup>145</sup>Luke, op. cit., p. 274f. Cf. too R. McL. Wilson, ibid, who after reviewing theories says the most natural reading of I Cor. 15 leads to the conclusion that the resurrection is denied.

<sup>146</sup>Bornemann, von Dobschütz, Wohlenberg, Frame, Rigaux, Masson, Best and many others. Cf. Chrysostom, ψευδοπροφήτας.

<sup>147</sup>R. St. J. Parry, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians (Cambridge Greek Testament), Cambridge, 1957, p. 181f. says that προφητεία would seem to include λόγος σοφίας and γνώσεως. Rigaux disagrees and contrasts them with prophecy, p.650.

<sup>148</sup>Op. cit., p.61.

<sup>149</sup>As Schlatter, ad loc.

<sup>150</sup>Masson recognizes the difficulty, pp. 93f.

<sup>151</sup>Plural: διακρίσεις πνευμάτων.

<sup>152</sup>See Bauer s.v. πνεῦμα Cf. Grimm-Thayer, p.522 πνεῦμα 4.c(a), "one in whom a spirit is manifest or embodied" i.e. actuated by a spirit which is divine or demonical" (cites II.2:2). Griblin is inclined to the view, p.148, n.2.

<sup>153</sup>p.503.

<sup>154</sup>J. Moffatt's view, ad loc., that it could be an oral statement based on certain logia of Jesus or contemporary history is unsubstantiated, The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians (The Exp. Gr. Test., Vol. IV), London, 1910.



<sup>155</sup>On δὶα with reference to letters cf. 1 Pet. 5:12 δὶα Σιλουανοῦ . This could mean (i) he was the secretary who composed it (ii) he copied it out (after dictation) or (iii) he was the bearer of the letter. None of these meanings is appropriate to II.2:2. Cf. E. Best, I Peter (N. Cen. B.), London, 1971, pp.176f.

<sup>156</sup>Bl.-Deb. para. 425 (4) suggest we supply γεγραμμένης or, ὡς ἡμῶν γεγραφότων αὐτῇν . For ellipses of participles, Moulton-Turner, p. 158, n.1.

<sup>157</sup>Rigaux, ad loc.

<sup>158</sup>Op. cit., pp. 92ff.

<sup>159</sup>p.100. Cf. Schmiedel, p.37 and Giblin, p.149 n.1. II.3:17 does not indicate the actual presence of false letters, it only suggests the possibility that some might be issued in the Apostle's name. As Rigaux, ad loc., says authentication is needed in view of the danger of false letters. Dibelius, p.48, following Harnack's view that II goes to a small circle, says the main body of the community will want to admit II as authentic but rely on I.

<sup>160</sup>Ad loc.

<sup>161</sup>E.g. Findlay, Rigaux, ad loc. Cf. I.3:5 ἔκεν ψα εἰς τὸ γινῶναι τὴν πίστιν ὁρῶν, ἢ πῶς ἐκείραθεν ὁρῶν δ' ἐκείρων. Μὴ with πῶς is frequent in Paul. I Cor. 8:9; 9:27; II Cor. 9:4; 11:3; 12:20 etc. See further Bl.-Deb. para. 370 (2). For ἢ τις introducing an independent clause I Cor. 16:11; cf. II Cor. 11:16; Bl.-Deb. para. 364 (3); Moulton-Turner, p.77 2.β ; Bauer s.v. ἢ A. III, 5 (a).

<sup>162</sup>Ad loc.

<sup>163</sup>For further and a more detailed discussion of this problem, chp. 6, pp.199ff.

<sup>164</sup>Bauer s.v. ἐξαπατάω ; A. Oepke, 'ἐξαπατάω' in T.D.N.T., I, pp. 384-385. The Aor. Subj. 3rd person is very rare in the N.T. Independent clauses are usually imperatival, Bl.-Deb. para. 370 (4), even with verbal forms such as ὁρα, ὁρᾶτε, βλέπετε, Mt. 8:4; 18:10; Mk. 1:44; I.5:15.



<sup>165</sup>MT has  $\lambda\lambda\pi$  which occurs again in Job 13:9 and yields the same association of deceit and mockery.

<sup>166</sup>Cf. T. Jud. 12:3 ἡ κατησέ με τὸ κάλλος αὐτῆς

<sup>167</sup>On the thought of self-deception H. Lietzmann, W.G. Kümmel, op. cit., p.17, C.K. Barrett, op. cit., p.93.

<sup>168</sup>As von Dobschütz, ad loc., remarks, the word does not necessarily imply deliberate falsification; it stresses that people are taken in. Findlay, ad loc., believes that the warning is addressed against a wilful and dishonest deception (v.10), but we cannot be sure Paul precisely knew the ways in which a false statement was being spread.

<sup>169</sup>Cf. C.E.B. Cranfield, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, (I.C.C., 6th edn., Vol. I), Edinburgh, 1975, p.352.

<sup>170</sup>Giblin, pp. 89ff.

<sup>171</sup>Not merely the three ways mentioned in 2:2 (as Oecumenius, Theophylact assert).

<sup>172</sup>Ad loc. P. Amh. 35:28 2nd cen. B.C. and P. London III. 951.4f. 3rd cen. A.D. Cf. also III Mac. 4:13; IV Mac. 4:24; 10:7.

<sup>173</sup>Frame, Rigaux, ad loc.

<sup>174</sup>For various satisfactory alternatives Lühemann and von Dobschütz ad loc.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### THE ESCHATOLOGICAL THEME OF APOSTASY

Paul links together two events The Apostasy and The Man of Lawlessness which must precede the Parousia. As they have not occurred, the Day of the Lord can not have come. The first of these to be mentioned is The Apostasy or Falling Away. Whether  $\pi\rho\omega\tau\omicron\nu$  is to be linked with  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  and taken to indicate chronological priority only is doubtful<sup>1</sup>. The adverb probably links the two verbs essentially and chronologically. We find the adverb again in I.4:16 in connection with the actual order of the resurrection. It occurs too in another apocalyptic context, Lk. 21:9, and refers to events which lead up to but are not directly prior to the End; they are signs which have to happen before the final consummation period. Von Dobschütz is probably correct when he connects  $\pi\rho\omega\tau\omicron\nu$  to both signs and points out that it refers not so much to their mutual relation but their common historical relation to the Parousia. This is virtually how it is used in Lk. 21:9,

#### Background to the Apostasy

There is no doubt that the Apostasy does occur first in time, but our interest lies more in the background to this idea. Ἀποστασία<sup>2</sup> is a later Greek form of ἀποστασίς. The latter denotes the action which makes a person an apostate, ἀποστατής and ἀποστασία can be thought

of more in terms of the subsequent state or result.

When the word occurs in a more political setting, the most obvious translation is 'rebellion'. So in Plutarch,

Galba, 1:9 τὴν ἀπὸ Νέρωνος ἀποστασίαν . Josephus, Vita, 43, 'rebellion from Nero', Apol. i.135-6, 'rebellion from Rome'. This sense is found in the Apocrypha too

I Esd. 2:21, καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἀποστάσεις cf. 2:17<sup>3</sup>.

All other references in the LXX contain a religious connotation, Jos. 22:22; III Kgdms. 20:13<sup>4</sup>; II Chron. 29:19; 33:19; Jer. 2:19; I Mac. 2:15. The Aquila text also has the same pattern, Dt. 15:9; Judg. 19:22; I Kgdms. 2:10; 10:27; 25:17; Prov. 16:27; Nah. 1:11. Apostasy may be a rebellion against Yahweh and a consequent departure from his standards, Jos. 22:22, or idolatrous worship, II Chron. 29:19; cf. Asc. Is. 2:4 or making overtures to Egypt and Assyria, Jer. 2:19. A good description of apostasy is found in I Mac. 1:15, "They made themselves uncircumcised and forsook the holy covenant and joined themselves to the Gentiles and sold themselves to do evil"<sup>5</sup>. There is always a negative as well as positive side to apostasy. The apostate rejects his previous allegiance and embraces another. In I Mac. 2:19 Mattathias declares the negative side, when he speaks of a 'falling away of each one of you from the worship of his fathers'<sup>6</sup>. The positive side is illustrated in Jer. 2:19 where Israel seeks the help of other nations instead of Yahweh. Of course the concept of apostasy is frequent in the O.T. quite apart from any particular word. To forsake Yahweh and his commands is the greatest danger faced by the

Israelites, Dt. 7:4; Judg. 2:3; Is. 1:4f.; 2:5ff.; Jer. 9:13ff.; Ps. 89:30ff.

The covenant idea becomes prominent in connection with apostasy, judgment and renewal. A passage in Ezek. 16 has all these themes closely interwoven. Yahweh, we are told, made a covenant with Israel, when she was in her youth, v.60, but this has been broken by her adulteries, vv.59,36. Israel has therefore revealed the true affections of her heart, v.37. Judgment will inevitably fall, vv.39ff., 59, but this will not lead to ultimate destruction but a renewal of the covenant, vv.60-62. The same thoughts are laid out in I Kings 8:22-53 and Neh. 1.

It is little wonder that apostasy from the covenant and the possibility of renewal feature in apocalyptic writers, where both ideas are firmly related to the End-time<sup>7</sup>. The author of Jubilees, when depicting the evil deeds of the last times, puts it down to the fact that the Jews have forsaken the covenant, 23:16<sup>8</sup>. The author of I En. 91:7 reports that 'apostasy and transgression and uncleanness will increase' and (93:9) 'in the seventh week shall an apostate generation arise, and many shall be its deeds, and all of its deeds shall be apostate'<sup>9</sup>. If Charles' emendation is followed in As. Mos. 5:6, the Jews are described as forsaking God before the End; 'those who wickedly depart from the Lord'<sup>10</sup>. The idea of apostasy is developed further in 4 Ezra. 5:1ff.; 6:24f.; 9:1-8; 16:18; II Bar. 27:6,7, but we must add a cautionary note. Any attempt to suggest that II draws upon 4 Ezra or II Baruch must first of all take into account any influence those writings have received from oral or written Christian thought<sup>11</sup>.

The Qumran sectaries were clearly worried by the possibility of apostasy. In the main their thoughts centred not so much upon Jews who had rebelled against God's Law as on those who opposed the sect and The Teacher of Righteousness. Ultimately of course all rebellion was against God, because the sect represented the truth of God. Members were 'the sons of light'. Readers and hearers of the Damascus Document are reminded of 'past rebellions' so that they will endeavour to avoid such pitfalls, 2:11-18. It was from apostate Israel that the true remnant arose to be established under the leadership of the Teacher of Righteousness, CD. 1:1ff.; 2:1; cf. 5:21; 8:19; 19:5,32. A description of the apostasy of the Wicked Priest is found in IQpHab. 8:10. In the same scroll apostasy moves from the past to the future. In 2:1-10, the unfaithful are those who have thrown in their lot with the Liar, and "did not listen to the words"<sup>12</sup> of the Teacher of Righteousness and broke the covenant. The interpretation of Hab. 1:5 goes on,

those who) will be unfaithful at the end of days. They, the men of violence and the breakers of the Covenant, will not believe when they hear all that (is to happen to) the final generation from the Priest (in whose heart) God set (understanding) that he might interpret all the words of His servants the prophets, (Vermes).

It seems fairly clear that the writer considered there would be a final apostate society, but it is doubtful if he regarded it as an unique End-time sign. The point of the pesher seems to be that the same apostasy which had afflicted the Jews in the past was troubling the sectarians now and would



continue to do so until the End. There is here a parallel with II.2:10. Covenant-breakers will reject the truth of the Priest, in the same way some will not receive the love of the truth.

Any estimate of the relationship of material between Qumran and II must proceed with care. Apostasy as a fact of the past, something present and to occur in the future is part of Qumran theology. But none of the writings hitherto published speak of The Apostasy, the final rebellion from God. It is significant that the War Scroll makes no mention of some defecting to Belial's side during the forty years' war. If a definite Apostasy was envisaged, a reference in this scroll might have been expected. Moreover in the Manuscripts as a whole there is a marked absence of any description of the general increase of evil just before the End. We have certain apocalyptic traits which appear elsewhere in Jewish literature (birth pangs IQM.5, conflagration IQM.14:17, a final Holy War IQM passim, and judgment IQM. 3:18; 4:20) but no Apostasy and Lawlessness.

In other intertestamental texts both themes occur. However since fragments of Enoch, Jubilees and unknown apocalyptic books have been found in the Caves<sup>13</sup>, it may well be that some, if not all the Covenanters, believed in an increase of Lawlessness and some kind of definite future apostasy. The apparently unsystematised eschatology at Qumran makes it impossible to be certain. Our study of Qumran and other Jewish intertestamental texts forces us to modify the conclusion of Rigaux, "C'est donc une tradition juive très répandue de réserver une place importante à



l'apostasie dans les prodromes de la fin"<sup>14</sup>. It has its place, but it is not so important that it has become a well-defined sign<sup>15</sup>.

It comes as no surprise to find the thought of apostasy in the book of Daniel. The persecution of the Syrian King, Antiochus IV, and the apostasy of the hellenistic Jews was bound to leave its mark on Jewish thinking and subsequent writings. The author, in commenting upon the Hellenizers of the time, says that Antiochus will, 'have regard to those who forsake the holy covenant,' Dan. 11:30, Theod. τοὺς καταλιπόντας διαθήκην ἁγίαν , cf. LXX, ἐγκατέλιπον τὴν διαθήκην τοῦ ἁγίου. On this statement we have the following points to make.

- (a) The kind of regard the king had for Jewish apostates is developed in II Mac. 4:7-15. Eager acceptance of Greek practices gained his approval, as did rejection of the Jewish cult.
- (b) The essence of apostasy is described as 'forsaking the covenant', cf. I Mac. 1:15.
- (c) The Hebrew word, אָפְסָה , is used frequently of apostasy, cf. Judg. 10:10; Dt. 28:20; 31:16; Jer. 1:16; Jon. 2:9<sup>16</sup>.
- (d) The Danielic figure of Antiochus was soon to become a supra-historical character in the role of the final adversary against God. The description of this king underlies Paul's description of the Anomos (II.2:4) so it is likely the apostasy associated with him has also played a part in

apocalyptic thought. The way the phrase 'Abomination of Desolation' is used by the Synoptic Apocalypse, cf. Dan. 11:31; Mk. 13:14; is an example of this. Moreover as I Maccabees describes the apostasy of the Jews to the ways of the Gentiles it appears <sup>that</sup> such action was unsolicited 1:11-15; the foundation was there for Antiochus to build upon later. Von Dobschütz is of the opinion that the Maccabean period is the "nexus" of the apostasy theme. He writes,

Die Makkabaer-Erhebung richtete sich gegen den Versuch des Königs, das ganze Volk zur ἀποστασία zu zwingen. Dies ist die historische Wurzel der eschatologischen Idee des Abfalls<sup>17</sup>.

He considers further, the possibility that II.2:4 is a reflection of the illegitimate cult of the temple under Antiochus IV, Dan. 9:26; 12:11<sup>18</sup>. We certainly agree with von Dobschütz that the Antiochian persecution has had a great influence upon the theme of Apostasy in II.2.

At the same time von Dobschütz quite rightly points out that O.T. texts relating to apostasy are the basis for the whole idea<sup>19</sup>. We would add that just as certain ideals and hopes for Israel were transferred to a future time, cf. Is. 24-27, so its failures were also related to the future. This we have demonstrated for the apocalyptic writers and consider it to be so in Paul's writing except that the whole idea is now in a Christian framework.

In the N.T. the word group and idea is no longer related to the Jewish covenant and Torah except for one instance. In Acts 21:21 mention is made of a falling away

from Moses, i.e. the Mosaic Law<sup>20</sup>. Otherwise apostasy is a defection from true Christianity, which takes place in the following ways: a falling away from the Gospel, Gal. 1:6f.; from the faith, I Tim. 4:1ff.; or, in the style of the O.T., from the living God into unbelief, Heb. 3:12; cf. Heb. 6:6 *κατακερόντας* ; 10:26ff.<sup>21</sup>, I Pet. 4:17; Hermas, Sim. VIII.9:1; IX.26:3; Ep. Barn. 4:10. There are numerous passages in the N.T. which bear on this theme of 'falling away'. It is unnecessary to attempt to list all of them. A few examples of the danger of apostasy for the early church will illustrate the matter. There is the common danger of listening to false teachers thereby becoming apostates. Clear warnings are given against this, II Cor. 11:13; Eph. 4:14; II Tim. 3:5ff. The rejection of the New Covenant and its faith means, in effect, a denial of the Lord who redeemed them, II Pet. 2:1, *ἀπρούπενοι* cf. Mk. 8:38; Lk. 12:9 and a putting aside of the faith which had been embraced, I Tim. 1:19, *ἀπωσάμενοι*. As in the O.T. there is not only a negative aspect, rejection of the Christian faith, but a positive acceptance of another or a different style of living. This may involve idolatry, immorality or false beliefs and a 'new' way which is a way without God, Eph. 4:17ff.; I Pet. 4:1ff.; I Jn. 2:26; Jude 4.

It is tempting to follow Hartmann's translation of *ἀποστασία* by 'rebellion' (II.2:3)<sup>22</sup>. If this suggests a political concept it is best to avoid the term. In view of the close alliance *ἀποστασία* has with *ἀνομία*, and the religious usage of the former

in the LXX, it is better to retain the word 'apostasy'. The meaning of the term should arise from the immediate context and other related passages. The noun, which we have said denotes the state rather than the act nevertheless includes both thoughts. It is impossible to separate the two. In conclusion then we may state that the O.T. background to the idea suggests a religious-ethical meaning which the N.T. confirms. Two N.T. passages come close to the idea of final apostasy, Mt. 24:12 and II Tim. 3:1ff. and both treat apostasy as a religious defection and subsequent state. However they both lack any concept of The Final Apostasy which the definite article suggests in 2:3.

#### The Nature of the Apostasy

We now come to consider the content of the Apostasy in our pericope. Just as there are opposing views about the Anomos and Katechon so there are different ideas about the Apostasy. It was common for the early church fathers to equate ἀποστασία with ἀποστασίς and refer the term to Antichrist, the Anomos<sup>23</sup>. Others of that period saw apostasy in terms of moral corruption and heresy<sup>24</sup>. The Latin father, Tertullian, believed it to be a falling away of the Empire<sup>25</sup>. Irenaeus gave it a Jewish connotation by indicating that Antichrist would sit in the Jerusalem Temple, and thereby demonstrate his apostasy<sup>26</sup>. The more political nature of the theme has been well-explored by earlier writers and latterly Wohlenberg has been attracted to it, but in association with religious connotations<sup>27</sup>.

Leaving aside the comments of the early church fathers, we can look at more recent suggestions. B. Weiss thought the apostasy was

Der Abfall des Judenthums von den lebendigen Gott (vgl. Hebr 3:12), der sich durch die definitive Verwerfung seines Messias und die Vollendung der Feindschaft gegen ihn (I.2:16f.) vollzieht.<sup>28</sup>

It is unlikely that Paul is dealing with a Jewish fall. His thinking no longer concerns the Old Covenant but the New. Can it be said that the Jews will reject the New Covenant; will this be the apostasy? Apparently in Paul's opinion the Jews had already done so, I.2:16, and it is hardly an outstanding sign.

Another possibility, similar to the early church identification of Apostasy = Antichrist, suggests the word has some connection with Belial<sup>29</sup>. Any relationship is at best tenuous and the readers would have difficulty in grasping the idea. If the noun is thought to reflect Dan. 9:26 and 12:11 (ἀποσταθῆναι, standing for the removal of the temple cultus) would the community understand even this fact? Jewish ideas might be in Paul's mind, but for the sake of his readers why was he not more explicit?

A more likely possibility favours the reference to a fall from the natural law. In Rom. 1:18ff. Paul makes it very clear that he believes men have rejected any knowledge they might have gained from Nature, in favour of their own desires and concepts. At the same time he does not appear to imply that this has happened at one particular point in history; it is a continuing process. If, as we



believe, 2:10 refers to the apostates as those who have chosen not to receive (deliberate rejection) the Gospel ('love of the truth'), then this invalidates the suggestion as it is clear that in Romans people reject natural 'truth', not the Gospel. Further we have in II a reference to a definite future sign, not an on-going process. Obviously von Dobschütz has recognised the problem for he makes II.2:3 an eschatological counterpart to Romans with The Apostasy remaining still outside the Christian community. It is ethical, not political, in nature<sup>30</sup> and paralleled in descriptions of general godlessness and moral depravity at the End-time, cf. he writes, II Tim. 3:1ff.; Mt. 24:12; Did. 16:3f.; Jub. 23:14ff.; 4 Ezra 5:1ff.; S.Or. IV.152ff.; VIII.188f.<sup>31</sup>.

We wonder if it was a marked increase in lawlessness that Paul intended to represent as an outstanding sign for the Christian community. We must remember that he is writing to show why the Day has not come. He mentions two particular events to demonstrate that the Day is still future. Would the suggestion of von Dobschütz be such a clear sign? If the apostasy occurred/in relation to the community, that is something which involved the 'membership', we would have a 'sign' which would carry more meaning for the church.

Having made this general observation we will consider two further points in detail. Not only will they pass comment on von Dobschütz's view, but indicate our own. Firstly we shall consider other references to apostasy, and secondly, we shall examine our passage to glean from it hints as to the nature of this eschatological theme. Firstly then



we study the apostasy theme. Paul deals with the subject in Galatians in some detail, 1:6ff; 4:21f.; cf. Phil. 3:2. The believers there were in danger of rejecting the Gospel as received from Paul, accepting a perversion of it and coming under the anathema of God. In particular there was the danger of coming once again under The Law from which Christ had made them free. In I Cor. 10:12 there is a possibility of departing from a religious-ethical standard and a warning is given, *βλεπέτω μή πέση*, reminiscent of II.2:3a. Although Paul can write about salvation and security, Rom. 8:38ff.; Phil. 1:6; II.2:13, he can also set out the danger of rejection by God because of unbelief. The apostate believer will have his works burned up because they are unacceptable, I Cor. 3:12ff. and Paul bruises his body into subjection lest he should be rejected, I Cor. 9:27 (*ἀδούκιμος*).

In later N.T. books apostasy is treated in greater detail, both as to its nature and its consequences. Hebrews (6:4ff.; 10:26ff.) speaks of those who fall away and have no chance of renewal. They have tasted of the things to come, been enlightened, partaken of the Spirit but still have fallen away (*παρκαπερόντας*). They have sinned deliberately after having received (*λαβεῖν*) the knowledge of the truth. Only judgment awaits the apostate. The seriousness of apostasy is reflected in I Tim. 4:1ff., *ἀποστήθοντες τινες τῆς πίστεως*. We should carefully note that they fall from the faith, cf. II Pet. 2:1ff.; 3:2ff.; Jude 18. They accept, on the positive level, false doctrines and listen to seducing spirits, *πνεύμασιν πλάνοις*. These last four references are all set in an

eschatological context and betray the worry and concern of the church at that period. Since they have a future reference they find a parallel in Mt. 24:12, where, against von Dobschütz, lawlessness (ἀνομία) is clearly distinguished from apostasy, which is described as ψυγίσεται ἡ ἀγάπη τῶν πολλῶν<sup>32</sup>. The affirmation of 24:13 serves to emphasize that works prove true love and faith, not that a future hope is secured by them. There will be those who belong to the faithful and yet will fall away. The author of I Jn. gives his own views on this. He suggests that although such people were once reckoned among the Christian community, they were never truly members of it, ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξηλθάν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἦσαν ἐξ ἡμῶν. If they had been true disciples they would have continued, μεμεινήμεναι = ὑπομενεῖν αὐς (Mt. 24:13?). What the author writes on this theme, he sets in the context of the Last Hour and the coming of Antichrist. The little antichrists, those who deny Jesus is the Christ, are the precursors of the One Antichrist, 2:22. It is quite likely that 'John' regarded these apostates as the foundation for the Future Apostate. If so there is a parallel with II.2:10 where the Anomos attracts οἱ ἀπολλυμένοι<sup>33</sup>. From this brief survey we can see that there was a growing belief and tradition that the last times would see some depart from the bosom of the church. In Paul we naturally find less on the theme since the church had not developed to the stage where heretical teaching and divisions were causing severe problems. It did not require however a great deal of foresight to see that what had happened to previous religious faiths and groups.

would also happen within the church. We have already come across some reasons for apostasy; loss of love for God, Lk. 18:7f.; Mt. 24:12; Rev. 2:4, the attractiveness of new ideas, II Tim. 4:3f. and a desire to indulge in sensual pleasures, II Pet. 2:2. The apostasy theme is continued by the author of the Didache. In the context of general lawlessness and seducing voices prior to the arrival of the κοσμοπλανή he writes of sheep turned into wolves and ἡ ἀγάπη στραφθήσεται εἰς μῖσος, 16:3. In other words the idea of apostasy does not concern a general forsaking of a moral law or 'natural knowledge' but a rejection of The Faith. It is not even a general forsaking of God, but a deliberate refusal of and withdrawal from the truth in Christ.

Secondly when we look at II.2 for any evidence in it to help with the interpretation of ἀποστασία, we are confronted with the objection of Rigaux and Ernst that the idea of a defection from the body of the church does not accord with Paul's ideas and it is certainly not on his horizon<sup>34</sup>. It is suggested that all he contemplated was a loss of faith in the sense of I.3:13 or II.2:15. These texts seem irrelevant to the discussion in so far as they have nothing to do with the Final Apostasy and only indirectly deal with 'falling away'. If it is objected that Paul has only here set out his belief in a future apostasy from the church, we can add that this is apparently true of the Anomos and Katechon themes<sup>35</sup>. He may have written about these themes in letters no longer extant, have explained these features to other churches cf. II.2:5, and possibly found the

original ideas in the oral tradition behind the Synoptic Apocalypse<sup>36</sup>. At any rate we can be sure that the idea of 'present' apostasy is firmly in his mind in Gal. 1:6ff.<sup>37</sup>. So there is no undue difficulty in envisaging Paul's belief in a very definite End-time sign of this nature. It appears to us that the objection of Rigaux and Ernst is invalid.

Moving to the passage itself, we note that Satan's Anomos works effectively amongst those who are perishing. These people are described in two further statements.

V.10 τὴν ἀγέπην τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἐδέξαντο.

V.12 οἱ μὴ πιστεύοντες τῇ ἀληθείᾳ.

It is on this basis that God's judgment is upon them in the form of The Lie, v.11. In contrast to these people, Paul can give thanks that there are others who have been chosen by God unto salvation, 2:13<sup>38</sup>. The contrast is not only one of election or non-election, but acceptance or rejection of the truth. Some had come to faith, πίστευε ἀληθείας 2:13, others had deliberately not received (accepted) and believed it. This implies that they had had the opportunity to do so, which indicates not merely a casual hearing of that faith. We should note that whilst Paul speaks of believers as those actually alive at the time of writing, those who reject the truth belong to the future and the coming of Anomos. Since the Apostasy is for Paul in the future, we are led to believe that the apostates of 2:10f. are in effect the Apostasy of 2:3.

Frame makes the interesting comment that the Greek phrase ἀγάπη τῆς ἀληθείας (only here in the Greek

Bible), suggests that God had sent those who ultimately rejected the truth the divine power to create in them a love for the truth of God (Rom. 1:25) or Christ (II Cor. 11:20)<sup>39</sup>. If his insight is correct we can see a further reason for Paul believing that this group had had a special opportunity to respond to the truth of the Gospel, but had rejected it. In our view then these people are apostates from the church<sup>40</sup> and not Jews who had rejected the Gospel message, or those who had rejected the 'natural truth' of God. The very word itself implies an already existing relationship which has been deliberately broken. If so it is unlikely we can refer it to the hearing of the Gospel message. They had refused the truth, which comes to mean ultimately, Christ, and it would appear they must have claimed to have once belonged to the faith<sup>41</sup>. Without doubt they provide the soil upon which the Anomos works and practises his deceptions. Not only will he carry them along but we can suppose that more will be attracted to his side as apostasy proceeds during his period of sway.

A summary of conclusions can now be set out as follows.

1. The term ἀποστασία is used with a religious connotation.
2. The word itself implies a definite departure from a previous relationship and acceptance of new (and false) beliefs or way of life.
3. The theme of apostasy in the O.T. and N.T. confirms that rejection denotes a previous relationship with God.

4. The article presupposes a well-known eschatological fact, at least, well-known to the Thessalonians. It is a definite sign which will be evident to the community, assuming they are 'awake', I.5:6.
5. It is an apostasy from the Christian faith and church. It does not concern an outside group such as the Jews or the falling away of the world into greater lawlessness. The future apostates are briefly described in II.2:10ff. in which passage the Anomos (= the Lie) is regarded as God's judgment upon such people.



<sup>1</sup>Rigaux, ad. loc., apparently takes the view that the adverb is linked to ἀποστασία "L'apostasie, premier signe que le jour du Seigneur n'est pas là". Frame, ad. loc., says we cannot be certain. Giblin wants to see a logical force in its use here, although it does appear to be impossible to remove the temporal aspect. He is probably correct in stating that if Paul wished to attach πρῶτον to ἀποστασία he would have added εἰτα as in I.4:16f. and placed it before the former noun, p.83 n.3.

<sup>2</sup>For the word see Bauer, s.v. ἀποστασία; von Dobschütz, pp. 269-271; J. Ernst, Die eschatologischen Gegenspieler in den Schriften des Neuen Testaments, Regensburg, 1967, pp. 27-32; Giblin, pp. 81-88; Milligan, p.98; Rigaux, pp. 235ff. and 654; H. Schlier, 'ἀποστασία' (also ἀφίστημι) in T.D.N.T. I, pp. 512-514 and ἀπρέομαι in I p.470. For the Latin translations of the term von Dobschütz, p.269 n.2, but they are of little help in deciding the meaning and content of the word in our passage.

<sup>3</sup>For the papyri, Moulton-Milligan, p.68, P.Amh, II.30:33f. (2nd cen. B.C.), the burning of title deeds by Egyptian 'rebels' ἡναγκάσθη ὑπὸ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἀποστατῶν ἐνέγκαι τὰς συνγραφὰς καὶ ταύτας κατακαῦσαι. No examples are given for ἀποστασία.

<sup>4</sup>So Codex A (LXX) translates לֹא יִשְׁכַּח : Theod. too.

<sup>5</sup>καὶ ἀπέστησαν ἀπὸ διαθήκης ἁγίας καὶ ἐξευγίσθησαν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν καὶ ἐπράθησαν τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὸ πονηρόν.

<sup>6</sup>ἀποστήναι ἕκαστος ἀπὸ λατρείας πτεέρων αὐτοῦ.

<sup>7</sup>For the Jewish Rabbinical tradition, Strack-Billerbeck, III, p.637 and IV, pp. 977ff. Schab, 138b says The Torah is destined to be forgotten in Israel.

<sup>8</sup>It is important to stress that Jub. 23 is not concerned with heathen wickedness but the lawlessness of the Jews. 23:19 is an amplification of v.16, 'They have forgotten commandment, and covenant, and feasts, and months, and Sabbaths, and jubilees, and all judgments' (A.P., II, p.48). A similar picture is given by Philo, De Proem, 148-152 = Strack-Billerbeck, III, p.291, De Execrat 6.

<sup>9</sup>Does this refer to the secularization policy of Sadducean-Hasmoneans? V.10 goes on to state that 'at its (i.e. the seventh week) close shall be elected The Elect righteous of the eternal plant of righteousness to receive sevenfold instruction concerning all His creation'. Cf. this with the thought in II.2:13. It must be pointed out that

in 1 En. 93 (The so-called, Apocalypse of Weeks) the second, sixth and seventh weeks are characterised by wickedness. We cannot find a definite End-time sign of Apostasy in the chapter.

<sup>10</sup>A.P., II, p.418.

<sup>11</sup>Ezra 9:1ff. seems to have a number of ideas which echo the Synoptic Apocalypse, e.g. earthquakes, tumult of peoples, confusion of leaders. The same may apply to T.Jud. 23, T.Dan. 5:4. However the many references to evil in the last days must go back to Jewish eschatological beliefs. For a thorough list of texts, Ernst, op. cit., pp. 30ff.

<sup>12</sup>The underlined words are the conjecture of Vermes and Lohse.

<sup>13</sup>J.T. Milik in 'Le Travail d'Édition des Fragments Manuscrits de Qumrân', R.B. 63 (1956) 49-67, pp. 56ff.; idem, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea (transl. by J. Strugnell, S.B.T. 26), London, 1959, pp. 32ff.

<sup>14</sup>Rigaux, p.255.

<sup>15</sup>It is only one sign among many. See D.S. Russell, op. cit., pp. 263-284.

<sup>16</sup>B.D.B. s.v. לִיָּו Qal. 2d.

<sup>17</sup>P.269. Also Ernst, op. cit., p.28.

<sup>18</sup>P.270

<sup>19</sup>P.269 n.4.

<sup>20</sup>Cf. II Mac. 5:8: Jason is an apostate from the laws ( ὡς τῶν νόμων ἀποστάτης ).

<sup>21</sup>Warnings are given by Ignatius against falling back into Judaism, Ad Magn. 8:1, 'Be not led astray by strange doctrines ... for if we are living until now according to Judaism, we confess that we have not received grace', cf. 10:1; Ad Philad. 6:1,2.

<sup>22</sup>Op. cit., p.198.

Moore, ad loc.

<sup>23</sup>Irenaeus Adv. Haer. V. 25:1ff; Chrysostom; Augustine Civ. Dei xx.19; Theodoret; Theophylact and Oecumenius. Wohlenberg suggests this identification is due to the Fathers regarding the Antichrist as Belial and the latter is translated in the LXX by ἀποστασία.

<sup>24</sup>Theodore; Augustine, ad loc.; Cyril, Cat. xv.2 (= P.G. xxxiii).

<sup>25</sup>De Res. Carnis, Rigaux, p.256, is wrong in stating it is the kingdom of Antichrist as such. Tertullian's words are, 'veniat abscessio primo, huius utique regni, et reveletur delinquentiae homo, id est antichristus'.

<sup>26</sup>Adv. Haer. V. 25:2.

<sup>27</sup>Ad loc. For earlier views, Bornemann, pp. 405ff. and von Dobschütz, p.270. The theory of a Jewish political revolt is particularly attractive to those who are persuaded that the parousia in Mt. 24 and II.2:1ff. refers the destruction of Jerusalem. Orchard, op. cit., p.41 refers to it as the unfulfilled event of the destruction of Jerusalem.

<sup>28</sup>Ad loc. J. Denny, The Epistles to the Thessalonians (Expositor's Bible), 1902, pp. 308f. suggests the religious defection of the Jews who crown their guilt which is mentioned in I.2:14f. Similarly Dibelius p.37 (2nd edn.) = p.45 (3rd edn.) p.45 says that the idea comes from Jewish circle of ideas and refers to the apostasy of Jews to heathenism. Oepke and de Boor, ad loc., stress that it refers in the first place to Israel. Best is attracted to this view pp. 282,308.

<sup>29</sup>Sirard op. cit., supposes that ἀποστασία is an anticipation of ἀνομία, vv.3,7,8, and the whole is influenced by the underlying idea of Belial, p.94. He is attracted by the idea that the word refers to the fall and removal of Satan (parallel in thought to ἐκ πέσου γένηται), cf. Rev. 12:7ff. but he rejects it on the grounds that the word has political and religious uses which forbid it, pp. 94 n.1, 98.

<sup>30</sup>p. 269ff.

<sup>31</sup>De Boor too. We can refer back to Palladius, Dial. de vita S. Ioannis, 74 who conceived of it as apostasy gaining ground. Bornemann thinks of moral defection but is uncertain of the area in which it will take place. Frame suggests the non-christian world; Bicknell too. Neil, (Moffatt), Morris, (Tyndale) and Grayston treat it as a human revolt and defiance of God. Rigaux pictures it as general evil at the End-time.

<sup>40</sup>For the view that the Apostasy is from the church Oecumenius, ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ or ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἀναχώρησιν; Calvin; Adeney; Findlay; Staab; Schlier, 'ἀποστασία', op. cit., pp. 513f. Lightfoot and Plummer remain uncertain as to Judaism or Christianity. Bailey, p.327 attempts to synthesize: 'The rebellion is strictly speaking within the church but the outcome affects the world outside'. Rigaux, p.258, is strangely ambivalent. He only gives the word a vague and general value (cf. Whiteley, Theology, p.236), yet resorts to vv.10-12 in order to fill in the content of the term. He sees in the rejection of the truth the seducing work of antichrist (cf. Chrysostom ὡς πολλοὺς μέλλοντα ἀπολλύναι καὶ ἀφιστᾶν). He argues thus because in his opinion the apostasy and Anomos are one and the same calamity (so arguing against his previous position of the prior event of Apostasy, L'Antéchrist et l'opposition au royaume messianique dans l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament, Paris, 1932, p.268). It does seem in II.2:1ff. that the Apostasy is prior to the Antichrist, even if we cannot deduce such from πρῶτος, 2:3. Gibling, whilst agreeing with Rigaux, goes further and maintains the term implies an ultimate division between believer and unbeliever. He almost wishes to translate, 'first must come the separation'. He admits he is on weak philological grounds and his texts (Mt. 13:43; 25:32) do not seem logically or temporally to apply to the Thessalonian teaching. Apostasy refers to an individual rejecting God and accepting another life; it does not refer to the separation of sheep from the goats, pp. 85ff.

<sup>41</sup>We can, perhaps, trace something of this idea in Matthew and Romans. In the Parable of Wheat and Tares (Mt. 13 = 24:30), the latter exist amongst the former, i.e. under the blessings of the church. In Romans the Jews are depicted as experiencing the blessings of being God's chosen race. They have the oracles (λογοί, 3:1), have experienced the long-suffering of God (2:4f.) and have the law (2:17f.). Unfortunately they are building up God's wrath against them by their disobedience (2:5,9). The conclusion is stated in 2:28,29; οὐ γὰρ ὁ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ Ἰουδαῖος ἐστίν ... ἀλλ' ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖός, καὶ περιτομή καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι. What Paul describes in Rom. 2 and 3 refers to the past and present but it does indicate Paul's view in Judaism; 'the true' and 'the false' can exist together.



<sup>32</sup>Giblin, p.82 n.1 also seems to be unaware of the distinction made by the evangelist.

<sup>33</sup>We have omitted Mk. 13:22 = Mt. 24:24 (cf. Lk. 21:8); Asc. Is. 4:9; II Bar. 28:3; S.Or. II. 168; III. 68 which deal with the deception of Pseudo - or Anti-christ(s). II Tim. 3:1-10 may also be more concerned with general lawlessness than apostasy (which is included in the thought of that passage).

<sup>34</sup>Both ad loc. Giblin's argument, pp. 84f., namely that the church was basically 'healthy' and the idea of apostasy opposes the fact, must be rejected. The Apostle would have had enough previous experience to know of the dangers to churches.

<sup>35</sup>If there is a reason for rejecting II it must spring from the uniqueness of material in II.2:1ff.

<sup>36</sup>Findlay, A. Plummer A Commentary on St. Paul's Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, London, 1918, Adeney and Staab (ad loc.) trace back the idea of Apostasy to the Synoptic discourse, (Mk. 13 and parallels). It may have connections with the tradition of that discourse, but nothing in the latter presupposes, The Apostasy.

<sup>37</sup>Galatians may have been written between 53-55 A.D. (Kümmel, Introduction, p.198), which shows that in a very short space of time after the writing of II we have the danger of apostasy appearing in an extant letter of Paul. Of course if the letter is earlier than II we have evidence that Paul was aware of heretical tendencies and defection from the church.

<sup>38</sup>Do we read 'chosen' ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, or ἀπερχόμενοι? B Gr<sup>1</sup> P 33 some old lat. sy<sup>p</sup> cop<sup>sa</sup> or 'ἀπερχόμενοι' B Gr<sup>1</sup> P 33 some old lat. vg sy<sup>h</sup> cop<sup>bo</sup>. For the former Bornemann, von Dobschütz, Rigaux, Giblin and Best. If we read the latter, Dibelius, we have to ask to what the "first-fruits" refers. It is not (a) the first group of converts: there is no supporting evidence and (b) the Philippians were the first converts in Macedonia, Acts 16:14f., 32f. In favour of the first reading is that it suits the context. Some had chosen deliberately to reject the Gospel so divine punishment comes. Those who believe do so because of their election from the very beginning.

<sup>39</sup>As against Lightfoot and Plummer and J.M.-O'Connor, 'Truth' in Paul and Qumran, 1968, pp. 193f., who see ἀλήθεια, truth in general. Cf. Rigaux, 'la révélation chrétienne'.

CHAPTER SIX

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL THEME OF THE ANTICHRIST

The word 'Antichrist' is only mentioned in I Jn. 2:18 in conjunction with 'many antichrists', cf. 4:3; II Jn. 7. The first passage shows that it was a belief connected with earlier tradition, καθὼς ἠκούσατε <sup>1</sup>, and it referred to an individual, ἀντίχριστος. We also learn something about the Antichrist in I Jn. through the way 'the many' are described, since they are held to prefigure him. These antichrists are (a) apostates, 2:19 (b) they deny the Messiahship of Jesus, his deity and humanity, 2:22f.; 4:2f.; cf. II Jn. 7, and (c) they deal in lies, 2:22, 26; cf. II Jn. 7. In other words they and the one Antichrist are primarily seen in religious terms and to that extent parallel references to false Christs in Mt. 24:24 = Mk. 13:22; Mt. 24:5. The anti of Antichrist can be taken in both its possible Greek and English senses; the figure takes the place of and opposes Christ.

We can give this title to the Anomos in our passage for the following reasons. Firstly the figure is set in the future and expected immediately prior to the Parousia of Christ, 2:8. Secondly, words normally applied to Christ are applied to this figure, e.g. παρουσία, ἀποκαλύπτω, ἐνέργεια, μυστήριον. Thirdly, his activity is in complete opposition to Christ, 2:4, 9ff. Fourthly, the section about his activity is set out in religious terms and to that extent parallels Antichrist in I Jn.<sup>2</sup> As in John's epistle



so in II.2:3f. the figure is an unique individual. There are no grounds for suspecting a collective interpretation<sup>3</sup>. We have him described as 'the Man of lawlessness' and 'the Anomos', 2:3,8, his actions are individualistic, 2:4,9ff. and his coming directly precedes that of Christ, 2:8. Attempts to fit in numerous antichrists cause considerable problems.

In our view he is also a man and not some supra-Man<sup>4</sup> or the Devil himself as Belial<sup>5</sup>. The latter suggestion makes nonsense of the statement in 2:9 which clearly sets the Anomos in relation to Satan but distinguishes the Anomos from him. He may be something other than man, which supra-human can imply, but there is insufficient evidence in this passage to establish the view. There is no doubt that the figure has supra-human powers from Satan but that does not mean he is other than a human being. The use of ἀνθρωπος, perhaps υἱός too, indicates that this is so. It is also unlikely that Paul has been influenced by the Ur - Mensch myth of a supra-being since such influence lies in the distant past. The more immediate origin of the figure springs from human historical antecedents evidence of which is found in 2:4 with its allusion to Dan. 11:36f. and Antiochus IV. So apart from his activity in 2:9f. there is nothing which suggests he is other than a human being and Satan's special agent.

This figure is called by Paul in the first place, 'the Man of lawlessness' 2:3. The importance attached to the latter part of the expression (lawlessness) is shown by the further use of ἀνομία, 2:7 and the cognate adjective ἀνομος, 2:8<sup>6</sup>. The word clearly highlights

the nature of the man and so it is to the meaning of ἀνομία (-ος) that we address ourselves.

We shall start by considering the use of the ἀνομία word-group in the LXX. A study of the related words reveals the following:

1. ἀνομέω : 33 times, no fixed Heb. equivalent.
2. ἀνόμῃα : 17 times, no fixed Heb. equivalent.
3. ἀνομος : over 100 times. It translates many Heb. words. If there is an equivalent it is  $\text{נֶפֶשׁ}$  (31 times but almost entirely in Ezekiel) together with  $\text{נֶפֶשׁ}$  (5 times).
4. ἀνομία : about 230 times. It is used to translate 24 Heb. words. Only  $\text{יָיָ}$  stands out as a possible Heb. basis, being translated 63 times by ἀνομία.  $\text{יָיָ}$  and  $\text{יָיָ}$  are translated 26 times respectively (the latter 25 times in Ezekiel).

Clearly we have to be very careful about finding a fixed Hebrew root equivalent to the Greek root. This becomes evident when we consider the distribution of ἀνομία for  $\text{יָיָ}$  in the LXX. We find this equation mainly in some historical books, the Psalms (24 times) and Job. (5 times). Otherwise it is virtually absent from the prophetic writings. The 63 times includes a few variants where other MSS. have a different word for sin<sup>7</sup>. The fact that it was used for  $\text{יָיָ}$  does show that the translators attempted to bring out the thought in the Hebrew term of iniquity, Job. 20:27, and the guilt associated with it, Ps. 50 (51):5; the two, as B.D.B. have noted, are not easily distinguished<sup>8</sup>.

A glance at the three N.T. quotations from the LXX where it is found does not help our understanding of the word either.

Rom. 4:7, μακάριοι ὧν ἠφέθησαν αἱ ἁνομίαι

= Ps. 31 (32):1, LXX; M.T. וְשָׁוָה .

Heb. 1:9, καὶ ἐρίσῃσας ἁνομίαν.

For the text, p<sup>46</sup> B D M; ἁδικίαν A 33 al. = Ps. 44

(45):8, α B ἁνομίαν , A ἁδικίαν

M.T. וְשָׁוָה .

Lk. 22:37, τὸ καὶ μετὰ ἀνθρώπων ἐλογίσθη

= Is. 53:12, ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη ; M.T.

וְשָׁוָה .

In the LXX there is the frequent use of ἁνομία and ἁμαρτία as synonyms (Ps. 31:1; 50:4; 58:4; 102:10; cf. Heb. 10:17)<sup>9</sup>. Words for sin are heaped together in the O.T. and this has lead to a merging of any particular nuance they may have carried; Ex. 34:7 and Lev. 16:21 ἁνομία, ἁδικία , ἁμαρτία ; cf. II Esd. 9:6,7; Prov. 6:12-14<sup>10</sup>. There is a tendency for ἁδικία and ἁνομία to become used as the chief terms for sin<sup>11</sup>.

Liddell-Scott give little information on the use of the word group in Greek. They note the various meanings for the words and cite a few examples to illustrate where appropriate: ἀνόμηρα , transgressor of the law; ἁνομία lawlessness, lawless conduct. opp. to δικαιοσύνη or the negation of law, so opp. to νόμος<sup>12</sup>; ἀνομέω , act lawlessly and ἄνομος , lawless, impious<sup>13</sup>.

In the N.T. we have in addition to ἁνομία (15 times)<sup>14</sup> and ἄνομος (10 times)<sup>15</sup>, the adverb ἀνόμως (twice)<sup>16</sup>. On the basis of a study of their use in the N.T. we have the following remarks to make.

1. In nearly every occurrence of the two words (noun and adjective) a contrast is implied or expressed<sup>17</sup>.

There is a particular contrast with the thought of 'righteousness', Mt. 13:41; 23:28; Rom. 4:7; 6:19; II Cor. 6:14; I Tim. 1:9; II Pet. 2:8; I Jn. 3:4 (with v.7); etc., cf. the 'will of God', Mt. 7:23<sup>18</sup>. In II.2:1-12 the expressions, 'loving, receiving and believing the truth' 20:10,12, imply a contrast with believing the lie and 'taking pleasure in unrighteousness', 2:11,12.

2. Etymologically, the word is made up of 2 parts,  $\alpha$ - (without) and  $\nu\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  (law)<sup>19</sup>. In many of the N.T. texts there is an implied reference to a law, whether the Mosaic, I Cor. 9:21a; Rom. 2:12 or God's moral law, I Cor. 9:21b. The implication of the  $\alpha$ - is that sin is committed with disregard to the law or directly against the law or in absence of a law. This can be seen in Acts 2:23; cf. Lk. 22:37 (also Ps.Sol. 17:18 (v.11 sing.- Pompey) ), where the plural is taken to mean Gentiles<sup>20</sup>. Does the word imply they are such because they act 'without the law' (they do not possess it) i.e. Gentiles, 'against it' i.e. sinners, or disregard it?<sup>21</sup> The same query applies to the noun. In Mt. 7:23 the 'workers of  $\alpha\nu\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ ' are contrasted with  $\delta\ \kappa\omicron\iota\omega\nu\ \tau\omicron\ \theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\mu\alpha\ \tau\omicron\ \pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \mu\omicron\upsilon$  v.21; this is the 'law' or 'standard'. The  $\alpha\nu\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  can be seen here under two aspects; an act against God's will and an act apart from God's requirements, a disregard of what should be done, cf. Rom. 4:7 etc. It appears to us impossible to erase either aspect from the texts in which  $\alpha\nu\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  (-ος) is used for sin. A translation which

limits it to 'rebellion' is only focussing on the 'against the law' aspect<sup>22</sup>. The scope of the word is wider and embraces the idea of disregard for the law. The best translation remains, in our view, 'lawless(-ness)'.

Lawlessness (with reference to the noun) can be understood in 3 ways.

1. a condition or state of those who commit sin.

Mt. 23:28, ἔστε ρεστοὶ .... ἀνομίας.

Rom. 6:19, τῇ ἀνομίᾳ εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν<sup>23</sup>.

Heb. 1:9, ἐρίσῃσας ἀνομίαν.

2. a general act,

Mt. 7:23, οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι (13:41, τοῦς κοινοῦντας) τὴν ἀνομίαν.

Mt. 24:12, διὰ τὸ πληθυνθῆναι τὴν ἀνομίαν.

Tit. 2:14 λυτρώσηται ..... ἀπὸ πάσης ἀνομίας.

3. specific acts (lawless deeds).

Rom. 4:7, ἀφένθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι.

Heb. 10:17, καὶ τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ μνησθήσομαι ἔτι.

It is interesting to note that on three occasions the noun is connected with Satan (or Beliar)<sup>24</sup>. In II.2:8f. the adjective used as a substantive has a similar connection<sup>25</sup>.

The adjective ἀνομος is employed absolutely to describe people as lawless, in three out of the six remaining texts (we exclude I Cor. 9:21, quater, which is used in a special way of those outside the Law of Moses and implies no criticism and II Pet. 2:8, which refers to specific acts.

of lawlessness, from the 10 possible texts). The three texts are Lk. 22:37, ἀνόμω = 'criminals'; Acts 2:23, διὰ χειρὸς ἀνόμων = 'Gentiles' or 'lawless people' and I Tim. 1:9, ἀνόμοις = 'the lawless'.

Is ἀνομία in some way an eschatological idea?<sup>26</sup> In Matthew three out of the four references are set in an eschatological framework, 7:23; 13:41; 24:12<sup>27</sup>, whilst it is obviously so in II and possibly true of I John. This is hardly enough evidence for using a word in an eschatological sense. However I. de la Potterie has argued that the eschatological sense is the most frequent in the N.T.<sup>28</sup> He writes,

dans le plus grand nombre de textes de cette époque ἀνομία sert à décrire l'état d'hostilité à Dieu aux derniers temps.<sup>29</sup>

The opposition, he suggests, implicit in the word is to the plan of God and not to the law, whilst, 'iniquity' is to be viewed under a satanic aspect<sup>30</sup>. However proof of what he says is lacking for the N.T. and his conclusion that the word (with particular reference to I John) refers to the spiritual reality of sin, its situation and state, and not bad acts which are committed, is very vague<sup>31</sup>. Certainly the word describes a state, but one which depends on the idea of law to give it the correct meaning.

Lawlessness and Lawless One denote appropriately the character of a figure who acts against and apart from God<sup>32</sup>. Both aspects, which we have previously discussed, are present in the passage. II.2:4 seems to confirm this.



The Anomos opposes God and sets himself above or over everything divine. The first clause shows the thought of rebellion against the law and the second states the other side to lawlessness, the total disregard for the law or anything religious. In its genitival relationship the word emphasizes the character of the Man who by his present absence proves that the Day of the Lord has not yet come<sup>33</sup>.

The expression 'Man of lawlessness' is almost certainly a Semitism<sup>34</sup>. In which case are there similar expressions to account for its use here? The following suggestions have been made.

#### 1. Man of Belial

This expression occurs in II Sam. 16:7; 20:1; cf. the plural, I Kings 21:13 and 'children of Belial' Deut. 13:13; Judg. 20:13; I Sam. 10:27; I Kings 21:13. This is further strengthened by the translation of Belial with ἀνομία in II Kgdms. 22:5 and Ps. 17 (18):5<sup>35</sup>. However Belial is translated by other Greek words<sup>36</sup> and in Paul's day was so generally recognised as a proper name in Judaism that he would not have avoided using it<sup>37</sup>. Even if 'man of Belial' suggested 'Man of lawlessness' (to Paul) we must not make the latter phrase or part of it equivalent to Belial.

#### 2. Sons of Iniquity

It is proposed that Qumran provides us with a background to the Pauline phrase in the expression בְּנֵי עֲוֹן ↔

בְּנֵי עֲוֹן<sup>38</sup> (IQS 3:2; cf. בְּנֵי עֲוֹן וְיִשְׁרָאֵל IQS 5:2,10;

9:17; also Ps. 89:23  $\text{לְבָרְכִי וְלֹאֲרִי}$  = LXX Ps. 88:23  
 $\text{υἱὸς ἀνομίᾳς}$  . At Qumran sons of  $\text{בְּרָכָה}$  are  
 opposed to sons of  $\text{לְבָרְכִי}$  (cf. II Cor. 6:14f.) in the  
 same way that we find, I.5:4f., sons of darkness and light  
 contrasted. Whilst the second part of the Semitism is a  
 suitable basis for  $\text{ἀνομία}$  , we would have to think  
 that Paul altered 'sons' (note the plural) to 'man' to suit  
 his purposes, and 'sons of ...' is a Semitic idiom in a way  
 'man of ...' is not.

### 3. Man of God

Giblin<sup>39</sup> has suggested that the Man of lawlessness  
 (= a false prophet) is set over against the true prophet,  
 $\text{ἀνθρώπος τοῦ θεοῦ}$  , a phrase used approximately 61  
 times in the O.T. He denies that the M.T. term is a pos-  
 sessive genitive (which it appears to be) and argues for a  
 genitive of qualification; man of God called because of  
 divine qualities given to him. Perhaps the reason for this  
 is that lawlessness does not exactly oppose the word 'God',  
 which is what is expected if there is, in II.2, the antithesis  
 of the true prophet (the man of God). We must also question  
 whether the Anomos is a false prophet. We have no examples  
 of false prophets aspiring to deity, 2:4. Moreover it would  
 have been simpler for Paul to write, 'Wicked Prophet' (cf.  
 Wicked Priest at Qumran IQpHab. 8:8; 9:9; passim; 4QpPs37  
 4:8).

4. 'Man of ...'

It is much more likely that we should consider Paul to have constructed his own expression on the basis of many Semitic phrases of a similar pattern. Probably this has already happened in I.5:5; 'day' may well be a Pauline formulation<sup>40</sup>. There are two avenues which may have influenced Paul's thinking.

- (a) The use of 'man' in the M.T. in genitival relationships. Examples of this can be seen in such expressions as 'man of war' Ex. 15:3; Jos. 17:1; 'of peace' Ps. 41:9, 'of falsehood', 'wicked devices' Prov. 14:17 and 'of understanding' Prov. 10:23.
- (b) The Qumran formulation of a term for their enemy, 'The Man of lies' ( אֱלֹהֵי שָׁוְיָ ) IQpHab. 2:1f.; 5:11; CD. 20:15 or 'Man of scorn' ( אֱלֹהֵי סָוִי ) CD. 1:14.

As we have no precise equivalent for 'Man of lawlessness' but many similar expressions we must consider it likely that Paul created the phrase to convey in terse form his conviction about the future figure and character. The genitive acts to attribute to the Man a description which suits the role he will play during the End-time period. We are now in a position to consider the background to this figure<sup>41</sup> and study in detail his activity for those who are perishing. We shall do so under four headings.

- I. HISTORICAL ANTECEDENTS FOR THE ANTICHRIST FIGURE
- II. THE BELIAR MYTH AND THE ANOMOS
- III. SATANIC POSSESSION: THE NATURE OF THE ANOMOS
- IV. THE REVELATION, ACTIVITY AND END OF THE ANOMOS

# I. HISTORICAL ANTECEDENTS FOR THE ANTICHRIST FIGURE

Certain passages in Isaiah, Ezekiel and Daniel<sup>42</sup> have been suggested as a source for the idea of the Anomos in Paul. We shall set out these passages below so that we can consider in detail their relevance for II Thessalonians.

## Is. 14:13,14

Σὺ δὲ εἶπας ἐν τῇ <sup>διανοίᾳ</sup> ~~διακονίᾳ~~ (καρδίᾳ, ᾧ C) σου.  
Εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναβήσομαι ἐπάνω τῶν ἀστρῶν τοῦ  
οὐρανοῦ θήσω τὸν θρόνον μου, καθιῶ ἐν ὄρει ὑψηλῇ ἐπὶ τὰ  
ὄρη τὰ ὑψηλὰ τὰ πρὸς βορρᾶν, (14) ἀναβήσομαι ἐπάνω  
τῶν νεφελῶν, ἔσομαι ὅμοιος τῷ ὑψίστῳ.

In this passage a taunt is taken up against the king of Babylon. The prophetic description vividly portrays the destruction of the king, vv.9,11<sup>43</sup>. In the text quoted above there are some very interesting parallels with the Pauline Antichrist figure in II.2:4 and we can set these out under four headings.

- |                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| i) Opposition to God:          | ἀναβήσομαι (εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν),<br>cf. ὁ ἀντικείμενος.                          |
| ii) Self-exaltation:           | θήσω ἐπάνω τῶν ἀστρῶν κ.τ.λ.,<br>cf. ὑπεραιρόμενος κ.τ.λ.                     |
| iii) Sitting in God's<br>seat: | καθιῶ ἐν ὄρει ὑψηλῇ κ.τ.λ.,<br>cf. καθίσει εἰς τὸν θρόνον τοῦ Θεοῦ.           |
| iv) Claiming Deity:            | ἔσομαι ὅμοιος τῷ ὑψίστῳ,<br>cf. ἀποδεικνύντα ἑαυτὸν ὅτι..Θεός <sup>44</sup> . |

In other words II.2:4 contains the very same thoughts as are found in Is. 14:13,14. Similar Isaianic descriptive language is found in Mt. 11:23 = Lk. 10:15, *ἕως οὐρανοῦ καὶ θύλακος* and applied to Capernaum<sup>45</sup>. In this abbreviated form the four elements are implied.

The Mount of Meeting, v.13, is regarded as the seat of God and is described as being in the far places of the North. Perhaps this is a reference to Zaphon or Mons Cassius, which is about twenty-five miles or so from Ugarit. In Ugaritic myth Baal had his throne 'in the heights of the north (syvt spn) and it is designated b'l spn or el spn<sup>46</sup>. The prophet appears to be putting into the mouth of the tyrant the language of Canaanite paganism and polytheism and setting out how he arises against all gods and objects of worship as well as showing opposition in direct contrast with God (cf. v.14, the Most High). The true seat of El was in Zion, Ps. 48:2f.

The Hebrew word *נָחַת* in v.13 can have two meanings in the Hiphil.<sup>47</sup> The LXX has chosen to understand the king to say that he will 'erect' or 'place' his throne above the stars of heaven<sup>48</sup>. This may well be true, but it is hard to erase entirely the other meaning of 'exalt, raise',<sup>49</sup> which is the way it is frequently used in Daniel, e.g. 5:19ff. (Aramaic). However the LXX translation yields a better sense since 'to exalt my throne above the stars' is not as good as 'erecting my throne above the stars' implying at the same time self-exaltation. The whole thought is of Babylon's king attempting to take God's place (note, the aspiration is in the heart) in the same way the Anomos sets himself above



all deity.

Ezek. 28:2

Ἀνθ' ὧν ὑψώθη σου ἡ καρδιά, καὶ εἶπας θεός εἰμι  
ἐγώ, κατοικίαν θεοῦ κατώκηκα ἐν καρδίᾳ θαλάσσης,  
σύ δὲ εἶ ἄνθρωπος καὶ οὐ θεὸς καὶ ἔδωκας τὴν  
καρδίαν σου ὡς καρδίαν θεοῦ.

This passage is cast in the form of a lamentation for the prince of Tyre and has affinities with the Isaiah text<sup>50</sup>. It is considered to be an oracle belonging to the editor but based perhaps on a poem by Ezekiel<sup>51</sup>. The ruler is thought to be Ittobaal II (574-564 B.C.)<sup>52</sup>, but whether this is true or not the language seems to go beyond the description of a human ruler. This becomes fairly evident from v.11ff. where the prince of Tyre is pictured in the garden of Eden. However vv.7ff. foretells an earthly destruction for the figure so we must not over press the point. It is rather similar to the Anomos who appears as a human figure with supernatural powers<sup>53</sup>. What is particularly important is that we have once again the four strands of thought which made up the picture in Isaiah.

- i) Opposition to God: v.2 as a whole and the force of 'I' which is well brought out in the LXX,  
εἰμι ἐγώ ; cf. v.6.
- ii) Self-exaltation : ὑψώθη σου ἡ καρδιά.
- iii) Sitting etc. : κατοικίαν θεοῦ κατώκηκα κ.τ.λ.
- iv) Claiming Deity : θεός εἰμι ἐγώ, cf. v.9.

These are obviously important elements in a description of a tyrant <sup>against</sup> of God.

Dan. 11:36,37

Without any doubt II.2:4 contains an allusion to this Danielic text, which reads as follows (in the version of Theodotion):

καὶ ποιήσῃ κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ καὶ ὑψωθήσεται  
(LXX, παροργισθήσεται ) καὶ μεγαλυνθήσεται  
(LXX, ὑψωθήσεται ) ἐπὶ πάντα θεὸν ἡ καὶ λαλήσῃ  
ὑπέρογκα καὶ κατευθυνεῖ<sup>7</sup> (LXX, ἡ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν  
τῶν θεῶν ἔξαλλα λαλήσῃ καὶ εὐδοκασθήσεται<sup>7</sup>) ...

<sup>37</sup> καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας (LXX omit π. ) θεοὺς τῶν  
πατέρων αὐτοῦ οὐ (LXX add μὴ ) συνήσῃ (LXX,  
προνοήσῃ ) ... καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶν θεὸν οὐ συνήσῃ  
(LXX omit), ὅτι ἐπὶ πάντας μεγαλυνθήσεται (LXX  
ὅτι ἐν παντί ὑψωθήσεται ).

In these two verses we find in the description of the 'Antiochian' tyrant the same four elements present<sup>54</sup>.

- i) Opposition to God: κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ  
cf. whole verse; 11:3,16 and 8:24)
- ii) Self-exaltation : Three times the text stresses this  
exaltation; the clearest adds  
ἐπὶ πάντα θεὸν.
- iii) Sitting etc. : We have taken previous references to  
'sitting' figuratively. The author  
of Daniel does not refer to a literal

of Antiochus himself in the Jerusalem temple but through the image he had set up in the Temple he can be considered to have done so. Hence the repeated phrase 'Abomination of Desolation' which occurs a few

verses earlier, 11:31, βδέλυγμα ἡφανισμένον (LXX, ἐρηρώσεως

- iv) Claiming Deity<sup>55</sup> : This is implied in the word ὑπέρογκα and the whole expression of v.36b (especially the LXX = M.T.), cf. no.ii.

At this point it becomes necessary to look at the phrase 'Abomination of Desolation' since it has certainly influenced the Synoptic Apocalypse, Mk. 13:14, τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρηρώσεως ἐστήκότα ὅπου οὐ δεῖ, and may possibly lie behind the creation of the Antichrist idea. It occurs in Dan. 9:27; 11:31; 12:11; cf. 8:13; I Mac. 1:54; 6:7.

- Dan. 9:27, □□□□ □□□□□□□□□□ 56:  
 Theod. & LXX βδέλυγμα τῶν ἐρηρώσεων  
 Dan. 12:11, □□□□ □□□□ :  
 Theod. & LXX, βδέλ. τῆς (LXX omits the article) ἐρηρώσεως  
 Dan. 11:31, □□□□□□ □□□□□□ :  
 Theod. βδέλ. ἡφανισμένον,  
 LXX. βδέλ. ἐρηρώσεως.

Dan. 8:13,  $\square \eta \psi \nu \psi \eta$  :

Theod. & LXX ἡ ἀρκαρία ἐρημώσεως

I Mac. 1:54 ὡκοδόμησεν βδέλ. ἐρημώσεως ἐπὶ  
τὸ θυσιαστήριον.

6:7 The βδέλ. was taken down &

ὡκοδόμησεν ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ  
ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ.

We may have (from the root  $\square \eta \psi$  ) four instances of the Poel participle, assuming the preformative mem is lacking in 8:13 and 12:11<sup>57</sup>. Otherwise we have the Qal participle in those two instances. The Hebrew word can have two basic meanings: 'be horrified, appalled' and 'be desolate, ruined'<sup>58</sup>. These meanings can be illustrated by reference to Ezra 9:3, 'I sat appalled (or astonished)' and Lam. 3:11, 'he has made me desolate'. In Daniel we could translate then, 'the Abomination which makes desolate' or '... which causes horror'. Although the active sense is less frequently found it is the more likely in the context<sup>60</sup>. However by using ἐρημώσεως (Theod. LXX and I Mac.) a passive use is suggested. Driver, citing 8:13, suggests that the LXX translators thought of the desolation as the outcome of the desecration of the Temple<sup>61</sup>. In other words the active participle has been changed into a noun commenting on the result of an abomination. To return to the original Hebrew text though, we may have both senses together, as Frost has argued, and can translate, "the detested thing which appals all good Jews and empties the Temple of worshippers and Yahweh alike"<sup>62</sup>. It could even be that the

root  $\square \eta \omega$  carries the sense of 'be mad'. As Antiochus was called Epimanes by his subjects, a word-play might be suggested: 'the detested thing of the madman',<sup>63</sup>.

Having considered the participle we must look at the nature of the 'Abomination'. It could be an altar to Zeus, possibly with an image of Zeus having Antiochian features<sup>64</sup>. From the Maccabean references it is clear that another (probably smaller) altar was placed on the Burnt-Offering altar, rather than an actual idol. Driver<sup>65</sup> calls it an idol-altar, by which he means, it was an altar with a possible image connected to it. Dancy<sup>66</sup> says it is hard to resist the conclusion that the abomination of I Mac. 1:54<sup>67</sup> = the  $\beta \omega \rho \acute{o} \varsigma$  of 1:59 and the phraseology of the former verse suggests that the same things (  $\beta \omega \rho \acute{o} \iota$  ) were built in Judah as Jerusalem. Some have argued therefore for bomolatriy by which the altar symbolizes or in some sense personifies the god Zeus<sup>68</sup>. It has much to commend it because litholatriy was once part of the Israelite cultic tradition and very common among their neighbours of the Maccabean period. If this is the case we would expect to find a reference to Zeus in Aramaic or Greek on the sides of the altar and at present the earliest known example is dated 160 A.D.<sup>70</sup>. It does not seem unreasonable to suppose that worshippers would identify the  $\beta \omega \rho \acute{o} \varsigma$  with the god worshipped. We can also conclude that some sort of altar was put upon the altar of Burnt Offering.

Dancy examines the evidence put forward to support the view of bomolatriy and thinks it strange that apart from the mention of idols in I Mac. 1:43,47 there is no evidence

to warrant such a view. He argues that if idols refer to cultic statues we should expect them to be referred to in Daniel or Josephus but there are no references. He adopts a middle way, arguing not for an image on the actual altar stone but an altar with some small cult symbol and that the altars in the cities of Judah were probably erected on some cult symbol (I Mac. 1:54). It is hard to be precise about the nature of the 'Abomination': it was probably an altar with perhaps a cult symbol or image alongside. From a consideration of the actual nature of the 'Abomination' we turn to the purpose and meaning of the expression itself. It has been argued that the phrase is really a contemptuous surrogate for the name of the highest pagan deity at the time, Baal Shamayim (  $\square\eta\eta\psi$   $\text{לעל}$  )<sup>71</sup>. The name is often found in Phoenician and Aramaic inscriptions (and also known as Hadad). The root  $\square\eta\psi$  is formed by an ordinary paronomasis (  $\square\eta\psi$  for  $\square\eta\eta\psi$  ) and 'Abomination' was substituted for abuse. Support for this suggestion can be found in the following arguments.

- i) Mephi-bosheth is used for Mephi-Baal, cf. II Sam. 4:4 with I Chron. 8:34.
- ii) מִפְּי בֹשֶׁת is used in the O.T. as a term of abhorrence for a pagan symbol, e.g. III Kgdms. 11:5 (7), εἰδῶ λω reading יִהְיֶה לְעֵלָּה
- iii) II Mac. 6:2, the Temple at Jerusalem is called that of Zeus Olympius ( Διὸς Ὀλυμπίου ). The Syriac reads Baal Shamayim.
- iv) In the Talmud the word 'idols' is used to refer to deities<sup>72</sup>.



v) Dancy surmises that Antiochus wanted the royal cult to be linked with syncretistic worship. The king was called Zeus Olympius Ephiphanes or, in dealing with Semites, Hadad and Baal. Perhaps, Dancy argues, he wanted to identify himself in Jerusalem with Baal Shamayim. There is no proof for this line of thought<sup>73</sup>, but the fact remains that he did term himself God on coins<sup>74</sup> (cf. Jos. Ant. xii.285)<sup>75</sup>.

In view of these points it would seem that the expression has been formulated rather than used 'accidentally'. There is a word-play which goes beyond the ordinary meaning of the terms, which themselves suggest 'an abomination which causes horror and desolates Temple worship'.

Understood this way the phrase contains the four elements which we have outlined earlier.

i) Opposition to God is seen in the erection of the altar and its placement in the Temple where God's name is, III Kgdms. 8:18ff.

ii) Self-exaltation by setting himself (i.e. Antiochus) above or alongside Baal Shamayim and Zeus.

iii) 'Sitting in the Temple' by an altar the king set up. The implications of this have been drawn out by both Matthew and Mark. The Markan 'Abomination of desolation stands (or is set up) where he ought not' and the Matthean is set, 24:4, 'in the holy place (ἐστὸς ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ)'. Both are obviously based on the thought of an Antiochian altar in the Jerusalem Temple. How far Paul was influenced by the phrase it is impossible to say. We know he drew upon

Dan. 11:36f. but whether his ideas were guided by the implications of the expression is less likely in that he writes of 'sitting in the Temple' which is a clear echo of Is. 14:13. The Danielic phrase is loose enough though for the interpretation of 'standing' (the most probable translation in Mark in view of the masc. participle) or 'sitting' in the Temple, since we are to think in figurative rather than literal terms of desecration.

iv) Claiming Deity by his actions.

Elsewhere in Daniel we find support for the four elements which we have located.

i) Opposition The little horn speaks against the Almighty ( εἰς τὸν ὑψιστον λαλήσει, Theod. LXX), 7:25. He is proud and stands up against the prince of princes, 8:25 and makes war with the saints, 7:8,21, and in the end he will destroy them, 7:25; 8:24. Two other references are made of opposition to God but in connection with other men. Belshazzar lifts himself up against the God of heaven, 5:23 (Theod. only), καὶ ἐπὶ κύριον θεὸν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὑψώθη, and the Persian ram is opposed to God by doing as he wills, 8:4, ( ἐποίησεν κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ, Theod: ἐποιεῖ ὡς ἠθέλεε, LXX).

ii) Self-exaltation The little horn exalts himself to the stars, 8:10, ( ὑψώθη ἕως τῶν ἀστέρων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, LXX), cf. what is said of Nebuchadrezzar, 5:20, καὶ ὅτε ὑψώθη ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ, Theod. only and Belshazzar, 5:23, Theod. Both the Persian ram and the Grecian he-goat aspire to the same heights, 8:4,8.

iii) Sitting in the Temple In 8:13 we find a reference to the treading underfoot of the sanctuary and this is termed 'the sin which desolates' (  $\square \eta \dot{\omega} \nu \nu \dot{\omega} \nu \eta$  Theod. LXX ἡ ἀρπαγία ἐρημώσεως ). In the passage 8:9ff. we have a picture of the little horn removing sacrifices and taking over the sanctuary which suggests that the Temple is used as a centre or seat from which to urge and encourage others to practise syncretistic worship.

iv) Claiming Deity This is implied by the way the little horn speaks great things or words, cf. 7:8,11,20,25. Clearly these refer to boastful claims<sup>76</sup>. The author of Revelation has interpreted them in terms of 'blasphemies', 13:6 and worship, 13:8. The latter implies deity.

Daniel presents a picture of Antiochus in which the four elements we have isolated are used to present an anti-God figure. The expression 'Abomination of desolation' also conveys these lines of thought. However there is no hint of Antiochus being the final Anti-God figure of the last times, even if the book of Daniel speaks of the End-time, 11:40; 12:9-13<sup>77</sup>.

Ezek. 38:1 - 39:24<sup>78</sup>

Rowley<sup>79</sup> remarks that the conception of Antiochus as an enemy of God is not without preparation in older literature, in particular in Ezekiel chapters 38 and 39. The figure of Gog<sup>80</sup> is placed in a very definite eschatological setting<sup>81</sup>. He and his hordes attack Israel but in doing so receive a 'visitation from God (38:16,8) which will be

devastating in the extreme (39:11ff.). In the midst of this the people of God will be kept safe (38:17ff.). These chapters are used by the book of Revelation, 20:8,9, with Magog<sup>82</sup> now a figure alongside Gog. Together an all-out final assault is made against the saints (it is Satan's last chance, 20:7) but the end is swift; κατεβη πῦρ from heaven, 20:9. Whilst the Beasts of Rev.13 and 17 can be treated as Antichrist(s) it is unlikely that Gog and Magog can be regarded in the same way<sup>83</sup>. Their aim seems to be political, if not militaristic and focuses on a final battle<sup>84</sup>. None of the four elements are present in the picture. This is true of the Ezekiel chapters, where a final battle is depicted in which Gog leads the forces against Israel, 38:14ff. The identity of Gog is not known and Rowley's view that

we have here the individualising of the opposition in the figure of a monster of iniquity, who will treacherously attack his weak and unsuspecting neighbours, but who will be destroyed by the power of God in a resounding disaster<sup>85</sup>,

does not commend itself since evidence for this opinion is lacking. There seems to be little relationship with Daniel<sup>86</sup> and none can be detected with Paul.

#### Psalms of Solomon<sup>87</sup>

The identification of 'the sinner' who attacked the Temple with Pompey seems fairly certain, 2:1. He comes from the west, 17:12, and is at first welcomed, 8:16ff. Later he finds resistance and has to use battering rams, 2:1. He allows the altar to be trampled down and defiled, 2:2, cf. 7:2.

We can consider what the Psalms of Solomon have to say by looking at the following two points.

(a) Terms Describing Pompey

- 2:1 The sinner waxed proud, 'Εν τῷ ὑπέρηφανεύεσθαι  
τὸν ἁμαρτωλόν.  
2:25 he is the proud dragon, τὴν ὑπερηφανίαν τοῦ δράκοντος.  
2:26 he is insolent, τὴν ὑβριν αὐτοῦ.  
17.11 he is the lawless one, ὁ ἄνομος

(b) Terms Relating His Activity<sup>88</sup>

- 8:20 he waged war against the people of God; 'he destroyed  
their princes and everyone in wise counsel' after the  
Temple was captured. He also 'made it (the land) waste'  
(ἡρήρωσεν).  
2:2 'he entered the Temple with his soldiers, alien nations  
ascended thine altar. They trampled (it) proudly with  
their sandals' (ἀνέβησαν ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον  
σου ἔθνη ἀλλότρια κατεπατοῦσαν ἐν ὑποδήμασιν).  
2:1, 25 he shewed the pride of all tyrants; 'he waxed proud'  
and the pious prayer is 'turn the pride of the dragon  
into dishonour' (ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ).

How far Paul may have been influenced by these thoughts it is again impossible to tell. Some scholars have tended to see in Pompey an embodiment of the Thessalonian Anomos<sup>89</sup>. In certain aspects (pride and lawlessness, war against God's people) he appears as a tyrant and the language is more reminiscent of Daniel. But there are differences

with II.2 which cannot be minimized. Paul's figure can work miracles and signs, has a religious following ('those who are perishing', 2:10) and, most important of all, attempts to take God's place as the final eschatological enemy of God<sup>90</sup>. The Psalms do not record Pompey entering the very Holy of Holies although Josephus gives us information upon this point; he is a political enemy who has arrogantly attacked the people of God. Pompey is not placed in an eschatological setting for it is as a result of what he has already done (his death has occurred, 2:26) that the author prays for David's son to come and destroy godless nations with the word of his mouth, 17:21,24. On the other hand characteristics of earthly rulers have been regularly transferred to an eschatological setting (e.g. Antiochus) and this may be true of Pompey. The language of Ps. Sol. 2:28ff. shows the beginnings of the transfer.

Josephus, B.J. ii.184ff.

It has been held that the attempt of Caligula to set up a statue in Jerusalem (40 A.D.)<sup>91</sup> has helped in the formation of Antichrist<sup>92</sup>. According to Josephus, Caligula wished to be considered and called a god (ὥστε θεὸν εἶναυτὸν καὶ δοκεῖν βούλεσθαι καὶ καλεῖσθαι). On the pretext that he had been slighted by Philo and others he ordered Petronius to set up αὐτοῦ ἀνδρίαντα ἐν τῷ ναῷ τοῦ θεοῦ, Ant. xviii.261. Tacitus (Hist. V.9) has in his account, 'effigiem eius in templo locare'. Fortunately for the Jews Petronius favoured their embassies and wrote to



the Emperor reporting that he did not intend to proceed with the order. At this point and before his reply could reach Syria the Emperor died.

As this event is in the recent past for Paul (and he must have been aware of it) it might seem likely that he was influenced by it. Bousset rejects any link out of hand<sup>93</sup>. Paul's Antichrist is a false Messiah sent to the Jews, not a threatened profanation of the Temple by foreign armies. Whilst we agree that the whole ethos of II.2:1ff. is religious we cannot a priori exclude the thought that Paul may have considered his Anomos would use political as well as religious means to obtain divine status and worship. The problem resolves itself into a question of how far the Church of 51/52 A.D. was interested in Jewish affairs.

I.2:14 shows that Paul knew of Jewish persecution of the churches in Judea and their present opposition. This of course sprang mainly but not entirely from religious motives. Acts 18:2 records the decree of Claudius which ordered Jews to leave Rome. It is mentioned to account for the arrival of Aquila and Priscilla in Corinth, but it shows awareness of outside political events. The appeal for charity, Acts 11:28, may reflect not only a concern for Jewish-Christians but also Jews. It is quite possible then that the church would take an interest in Caligula's attempt to usurp God's place with an image of himself, if only because it might herald future persecution against the new sect of the Nazarenes. In addition to which it has been thought the Synoptic Apocalypse arose from the crisis of 40 A.D. and that Paul has used and modified this document<sup>94</sup>.

We have surveyed the likely historical antecedents of the Anomos and are in a position to set down our conclusions from the material considered.

1. No definite evolutionary pattern of thought can be traced which leads to the Pauline eschatological figure of Antichrist.
2. The Psalms of Solomon and Caligula's attempt to set up an image in the Temple provide more recent immediate examples for Paul of enemies of God upon which he may have drawn for his own figure. In both cases however no eschatological End-time enemy of God is described and they fall far short of the Pauline description.
3. The language of Is. 14, Ezek. 28 and Dan. chps. 7,8,9,11 provide the most likely backgrounds to the Anomos. Whereas in one sense all who oppose God are his enemies in these passages we find three historical figures (king of Babylon, prince of Tyre and Antiochus IV) who have become more than general enemies of God. Highly poetic language is used to focus their particular sin of pride and self-exaltation, and their desire to usurp God's place. At times the language demands that we think not so much of a supra-human being but a man who has supernatural powers. Is. 14:16,17 conveys this suggestion, 'Is this the man who made the earth to tremble, who did shake the kingdoms, who made the world as a wilderness and overthrew its cities?' cf. Ezek. 28:11ff. and Dan. 11:36f.

It is obvious that the latter text has helped to mould the Anomos picture by the allusion to it in II.2:4. However there is one difference. These historical enemies are not regarded as The eschatological Opponent of God as is the case with Paul's figure.

4. We have suggested that four elements are used to clothe, as it were, particular enemies of God. These four are employed to show the enormity of the crime against the living God. It is the same pattern which Paul has used in 2:4 and which he further amplifies in 2:9ff. All of these elements are inter-linked but nonetheless identifiable and help to elucidate the character of God's adversary.

## II. THE BELIAR MYTH AND THE ANOMOS

A second suggested background is the Beliar (or Belial) myth. Those who follow this view (after W. Bousset, The Antichrist Legend) assume that the figure of Beliar has played a large part in the Pauline formation of the future Anomos. The evidence can be summed up in four points.

- i) Paul was already acquainted with the name, II Cor. 6:15, τίς δὲ συμφώνησις Χριστοῦ πρὸς Βελιάρ. <sup>95</sup>;
- ii) 'Man of lawlessness' is probably a translation of the Hebrew לְעֵלִי לְעֵלִי.
- iii) Beliar's actions and characteristics fit those of the Anomos.
- iv) Beliar is nothing less than the metamorphosed Dragon who appears as the wicked angel. As Paul is familiar with 'the figure as the opponent of the Messiah in the last days' he has humanised it into the Man of lawlessness <sup>96</sup>.

Most, if not all the evidence for these points is found in Intertestamental literature. However references to Belial are found in the O.T. but the problem is whether we should treat the word as a proper name or an abstract noun. The etymology of the word is very uncertain. The Rabbinical view was that Belial signified 'one without the yoke' (Sanh. 111b), that is, the yoke of the Law <sup>97</sup>. The usual view of its etymology derives it from לְעֵלִי (without) and לְעֵלִי (worth), hence 'worthlessness' <sup>98</sup> and giving the idea of great wickedness. Cheyne <sup>99</sup> is dissatisfied with this explanation and regards the expression as denoting 'hopeless ruin'. For him the word is a mythological survival conjuring up the

name of a subterranean watery abyss which was understood to mean, 'the depth which lets no man return' (  $\text{לְעֵלְיָהוּ} \leftrightarrow \text{לְיָדָי}$  ). Gaster<sup>100</sup> compares the expression with Job 26:7,  $\text{לֹא־יָדָעָהּ} \text{לְעֵלְיָהוּ}$  (nothingness cf. Ugaritic,  $\text{bl mt}$ , not death = immortality) and Jer. 2:11,  $\text{לֹא־יָנִיף}$  , 'does not profit'.

#### A. Belial in the O.T.<sup>101</sup>

Whatever the true etymology of the word, and we do not need to determine it, it became used in an expression which is popular in I and II Samuel (I Sam. 1:16; 2:12; 10:27; 25:17,25; 30:22; II Sam. 16:7; 20:1; 23:6). In these texts, as with others (e.g. Deut. 13:13; II Chron. 13:7) we find the word in expressions such as 'man, daughter, children and sons of Belial'. The word denotes wrongdoers and reflects the fact that such people have given themselves over to wickedness<sup>102</sup>. The LXX demonstrates this by the variety of expressions used, I Kgdms. 1:16  $\lambda\omicron\iota\mu\eta\acute{\nu}$  ; Deut. 13:14  $\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\rho\omicron\iota$  ; Prov. 6:12  $\acute{\alpha}\phi\rho\omega\nu$  ; Deut. 15:9  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\rho\eta\mu\alpha$  ; III Kgdms. 20 (21):13 A  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$  II Kgdms. 22:5  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$  . Very occasionally the Greek retains the Hebrew word, Judg. 19:22 (Theod.); Prov. 16:23 and Gaster<sup>103</sup> has alleged that we have a clear tradition of a proper name. This is doubtful for two reasons. Firstly the various translations of the term reveal the difficulty of finding the correct meaning. It was easier in the texts mentioned to transliterate. Secondly it might be under the influence of later literature (e.g. that of Qumran) in which Belial is a personal name,

that the original word was retained.

The most interesting O.T. reference of all occurs in Nah. 2:1; (LXX does not translate Belial and has a plural for יוֹסִיף, ἰουδαῖοις). The Hebrew reads, כִּי לֹא יוֹסִיף עוֹד לְעַבְדֹּת-בְּעִלְזָה 'for Belial shall not for ever ...'. Is Belial a proper name? Gaster believes it is a malevolent power either human or demonic<sup>104</sup>. It is impossible to say if the latter is true; the context does not favour it. If it is not a proper name it is no longer an abstract noun either since it must be translated 'the wicked one' or 'the wicked' (collective sing.). The word can now be used without 'son' or the like preceding it.

#### B. Beliar in the Intertestamental Literature (excluding DSS)<sup>105</sup>

##### Jubilees<sup>106</sup>

Fragments of this book have been found at Qumran so it may be that the book originated from that milieu<sup>107</sup>. However we shall look at it in this section. The writer looks forward to a gradual coming of the kingdom rather than some future catastrophic day<sup>108</sup>. In the book we find various names for the leader of demons and 'spiritual enemy of God'; Beliar<sup>109</sup>, Satan<sup>110</sup> and Mastema<sup>111</sup>. We cannot doubt that Mastema is used as a name (cn. IQM 13:11 where we have 'Thou wast the one (God) who made Belial to corrupt, an angel of hatred' מַלְאָכִי הַשֹּׂנֵא )<sup>112</sup> and almost certainly Satan must be treated in the same way. Evidence of this comes from 10:8ff. Mastema, prince of the spirits, asks for God's



freedom for his spirits to exercise their dominion, but only a part are given under the control of Satan. Beliar can also be considered a name with some reservation since we have the O.T. phrase recurring 'sons of Beliar', 15:23 and 'spirit of Beliar', 1:20 may carry only the idea of wickedness<sup>113</sup>.

There is a very highly developed idea of Mastema and his activities in Jubilees with special emphasis on the work of the spirits in leading men astray. However there is still quite a difference between the Satan of the N.T. and the picture provided Jubilees and there is no hint of Mastema in the role of the Final Eschatological Enemy of God.

#### The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs

The problem facing us is that of deciding if certain texts are wholly Jewish or have been redacted or interpolated by Christians and if the latter how far can we evaluate the original ideas<sup>114</sup>. We shall first of all consider texts as they stand before making any assessment. The overwhelming name for the chief of spirits is Beliar<sup>115</sup>, otherwise very rarely do we read of Satan<sup>116</sup>. In our study we shall consider those references which have a definite eschatological setting; T.Iss. 6:1; T.Dan. 5:10; T.Lev. 18:2,12; T.Jud. 25:3. The exact points to note will be the nature of Beliar's role against Messiah and before the End-time. Does he act only as the spiritual enemy of God and Messiah in his role as ruler of evil spirits, or as Antichrist (or possibly both)?

T.Iss. 6:1, 'In the last times' the sons of Issachar '... will cleave unto Beliar' (ἐν ἐσχάτοις καιροῖς ... κολληθήσονται τῷ βελιάρ ).

There is no portrayal of Beliar as the last great enemy of God, certainly not a human enemy, nor do we find those who cleave to him acting out this role.

T.Dan. 5:10, 'And there shall arise unto you from the tribe of Judah and Levi the salvation of the Lord;<sup>117</sup> and he shall make war against Beliar'. It is doubtful if we can read the whole of the chapter and this verse in particular of Beliar as Antichrist<sup>118</sup>. Irrespective of whether we have one or two Messiahs (note 'and he shall make',

αὐτὸς ποιήσει )<sup>119</sup> the battle does not appear to be an earthly one. In parallel with making war on Beliar we have 'and he will give a victorious vengeance on our enemies'.

This may indicate that Beliar's destruction is through the downfall of his kingdom. This is clarified perhaps in v.11 which speaks of 'the captivity he (Messiah) shall take from Beliar' which implies Beliar will lose control over people, even if we discount, as Charles<sup>120</sup>, the following phrase, 'souls of the saints'. So the battle concerns men's hearts not a military fight. How this will happen is not explained<sup>121</sup>.

T.Lev. 18:2,12, 'The Lord will raise up a new priest ... v.12, and Beliar will be bound by him'. No great catastrophe or war occurs before he is bound. The picture is very similar to Rev. 20:2 where Satan is bound.

T.Jud. 25:3, 'There shall be no deceitful spirit of Beliar, for he shall be cast into the fire forever'. This is so very similar to Rev. 20:10 that borrowing must be sus-

pected. Although the whole passage (25:1 - 26:4) is very Jewish in tone, there is no evidence of an Antichrist figure.

Apart from these references which describe the end of Beliar at the End-time there are no other texts which might support his identification with Antichrist. In fact we do not have any clear opposition defined in Anti-Messiah terms. Beliar appears through out the Testaments (and we include the name 'Satan') as the Spirit who directs other spirits to ensnare and deceive men, T.Reub. 2:2; T. Dan. 5:6<sup>122</sup>. What he does is opposed to God's Law, T.Lev. 19:1; T.Iss. 6:1. He rules over disturbed souls, T. Dan. 4:7 or those who give way to their own evil inclination, T.Ash. 1:8. He flees from those who keep the Law and the righteous, T.Dan. 5:1; T.Naph. 8:4. Beliar is constantly at war with God until he is bound. There is no picture of him making a last desperate effort to thwart his doom.

We are disposed to think that the eschatological texts we have cited have come from original Jewish sources. The context to these references does not suggest that we have a Christian work for these particular sections. Even if the work or various parts of it are wholly Christian it does not affect our main contention, that before the writing of II we do not have a portrayal of Beliar (or a man) as Antichrist.

### I Enoch<sup>123</sup>

There is no reference to Beliar in the various sections of this book. However we do come across various names of the chief of evil spirits. He is frequently called Azazel<sup>124</sup> (e.g. I En. 8:3; 54:5), Satan (54:6) and Semjaza<sup>125</sup>

(6:3; 8:3; 9:7; 10:11 cf. 6:7 = Samjaza 69:27). There are frequent references in the Similitudes to 'satans' who are presumably evil spirits, (40:7; 53:3; 56:1; 62:11; 63:1; 65:6; 69:4). No picture of these or their leader suggests an (incarnate) Antichrist.

#### The Assumption of Moses<sup>126</sup>

10:1 reads, 'And then his kingdom shall appear throughout all his creation and then Satan (Zabulus) shall be no more'. The following 'sorrow shall depart with him' suggests we have an evil person. But is this person demoniac or human? As Charles notes, 10:2b 'and he (an angel) shall immediately avenge them of their enemies', suggests an adversary of Israel, (i.e. someone human)<sup>127</sup>. This is the only reference to 'Satan' in the Assumption; on the other hand Zabulus, i.e. diabolus, was a form frequent in the Latin fathers<sup>128</sup>. There is again no hint of Satan as Antichrist.

#### Testament of Job

There are quite a few references to Satan<sup>129</sup> but none which suggest him to be other than the Devil (ὁ δὲ βολος) who wages war against and shows malice to humans, III:3,6. He disguises himself so as to deceive people, VI:4; VII:6.

The Ascension of Isaiah<sup>130</sup>

In this book Beliar as Antichrist is very apparent.

The most important passage on Beliar occurs in 4:2ff. :

Beliar, the great prince, the king of this world who has ruled it since it came into being, shall descend; he will come down from his firmament in the form of a man, a lawless king, a slayer of his mother, who himself (even) this king will (3) persecute the plant which the Twelve Apostles of the Beloved have planted; and one of the twelve will be delivered into his hand. (4) This ruler will thus come in the likeness of that king and there will come with him all the powers of this world and they will hearken to him in all that he desires. (Hennecke).

There follows a description of the works of Beliar, vv.5-18. He makes the sun rise at night, the moon shine at the sixth hour, claims deity and worship, performs miracles and sets up images, cf. 2:4ff. Beliar is presented firstly as the Satanic being who rules the world, cf. 10:29; Jn. 12:31; II Cor. 4:4 and secondly as incarnate in a human king, probably Nero<sup>131</sup>. In this form he acts out an eschatological role as the final opponent of the Beloved. Without doubt we have Beliar-Antichrist. However the whole problem revolves around the dating of the book or this particular section. In our view we can not, as Charles does, separate vv.4ff. from the previous two verses and regard them as a Christian addition. The whole passage is Christian in origin and based, so it appears, to a great extent on II.2:3ff. and Thessalonian eschatology.

Asc.Is. 4:5 = II.2:9, performs signs  
4:6 = 2:4, claims to be God, cf. S.Or. V.33f.  
= XII.85f.  
4:9 = 2:10ff., deceives many.  
4:13 = I.4:13, saints await the Beloved.  
4:15 = I.3:13 and II.1:6,7, The Lord comes with  
his armies.  
4:16 = 4:14, saints come with the Lord.

If it is reasonable to assume that this chapter reflects II.2:3ff. we have a picture of one author's view of the Anti-christ around 80-100 A.D.

## The Sibylline Oracles

We have clear references to Beliar as Antichrist in these oracles: II.167f.; III.63ff.; IV.119-122, 137-139; V.143-147, 361ff. Translations of the passages run as follows.

II.167f. 133

And Beliar too shall come and do many signs  
For men.

III. 63ff.

From the stock of Sebaste Beliar will come in later  
time  
And shall raise the mountain heights and raise the sea  
The great fiery sun and the bright moon  
And he shall raise up the dead and shall perform many  
signs  
For men: but they shall not be effective in him.  
Nay but he deceives mortals, and many shall he deceive,  
Hebrews faithful and elect and lawless too, and other  
Men who have never yet listened to the word of God.



This is followed by a mention of the end of Beliar and his followers (they are burnt up) and the world coming under the dominion of a widow<sup>134</sup>. The latter does suggest that Beliar is not necessarily the final enemy of God. The relationship between the widow, Beliar and the End-time is not at all clear.

## IV.119-122

And then from Italy a great king, like a fugitive  
 slave,  
 Shall flee unseen, unheard of, over the passage of  
 the Euphrates;  
 When he shall dare even the hateful pollution of a  
 mother's murder,  
 And many other things beside, venturing so far with  
 wicked hand.

## 137-139

And to the west shall come the strife of gathering  
 war,  
 And the exile from Rome, brandishing a mighty sword,  
 Crossing the Euphrates with many myriads.

## V.143-147

Then shall flee from Babylon a king fearful and  
 shameless  
 Whom all mortals and all the best men loathe.  
 For he destroyed many and laid his hands on the womb  
 And sinned against wives and was born of abominable  
 parentage.  
 He shall come to the Medes and to the kings of the  
 Persians ...

## 361ff.

There shall be at the last time, about the waning  
 of the moon,  
 A world-convulsing war deceitful in guilefulness.  
 And there shall come from the ends of the earth a  
 matricide  
 Fleeing and devising sharp-edged plans in his mind.  
 He shall ruin all the earth and gain all power,  
 And surpass all men in the cunning of his mind...

These last four passages relate the Nero redivivus myth and although connected with the End and probably regarding Nero as The Enemy of God they are much later than II.2:1ff. and do not bear upon the interpretation of that passage. As for the other two, Bousset is clear that III.63ff. is entirely Jewish and refers to Beliar Antichrist. If Bousset is right, and it is doubtful<sup>135</sup>, we have ca. B.C. 30 an identification of Antichrist with Beliar; in fact we have the first fairly clear reference to Antichrist (without the actual use of the term) preceding the End of all things.

#### C. Belial in the Dead Sea Scrolls<sup>136</sup>

In the writings of the community Belial appears as the spiritual enemy of the members and God<sup>137</sup>. Although it is not stated, Belial appears to be the equivalent of Satan. It has been argued that the abstract idea prevails to a great extent throughout the Hebrew Texts from Cave I<sup>138</sup>, but that in IQM for the most part Belial is a personal enemy, sometimes incarnate in human men. P. von der Osten-Sacken has made a study of the texts and comes to the opposite conclusion. IQM 1 represents the oldest form of dualism, characterised as it is by elements of the O.T. tradition of the Holy War and a war situation. He identifies Belial (from IQM 1) with Antiochus IV<sup>139</sup>. Next in time come texts in IQS (3:13 - 4:14 and 4:15-26)<sup>140</sup> and finally references in the Damascus Document<sup>141</sup>. A revival of eschatological elements within the dualistic tradition is noted in 11Q Melch<sup>142</sup>. In our opinion it is difficult not to view Belial as a proper name, IQH 4:10,13; 7:3; IQS 1:18,24; IQM 14:9, since he acts in

a way which suggests he is personal. Certainly there can be little room for doubt in the War Scroll where he is the leader of the 'sons of darkness' during the drawn out eschatological battle and in the end will be cast into eternal destruction (IQM 1:1,5; 13:11; cf. IQS 2:5). However nowhere do we find any hint of Belial being incarnate in a human being or, for that matter, the last Opponent of God. Nor does he promote a human being to this role. Other texts which mention the name confirm this view. Belial is at the head of the spirits of wickedness, who has led the enemies of the sect, and whose aim is to corrupt, CD 4:12,13; IQM 13:11. But Belial is powerless to harm those who observe the Law, IQS 2:4,5<sup>143</sup>. These statements agree with what we know of Belial in Jubilees, Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and I Enoch (Azazel).

### Conclusions

1. Apart from texts which are most probably Christian or written later than II (The Ascension of Isaiah and The Sibyls) we have no evidence for a Beliar Antichrist.
2. Belial is another name for the N.T. Satan (cf. II Cor. 6:15). In the literature we have surveyed he is more the chief of evil spirits than the great adversary of God which is how he appears in Paul and the N.T. as a whole.
3. This study only helps to provide the background for section III and shows the enemy of God who is to provide, according to Paul, an eschatological Anomos. Paul makes it very clear that II.2:9 does not reflect a fusionem but a

relationem between Satan and the Antichrist figure.

Conclusion to a Study of Historical Antecedents  
and the Beliar Myth

No scholar since W. Bousset<sup>144</sup> and R.H. Charles<sup>145</sup> has tried to provide a synthesis of available evidence to account for the Antichrist figure. The approach of Rigaux<sup>146</sup> and Ernst<sup>147</sup> has been to study individual passages from the O.T. and other Jewish literature to try and find a background for the Pauline Anomos but they have not really attempted a historical synthesis or traced the Beliar myth through its traditionsgeschichte. Before stating our own conclusions it would be as well to give a short summary of the views of Bousset and Charles.

I. Beliar-Antichrist

Bousset approached his study on the basis of previous work done by Gunkel<sup>148</sup>. The latter suggested that eschatological conceptions emerged from esoteric oral tradition. Bousset has developed the view by

- (a) putting forward a hypothesis of a secret Jewish Antichrist tradition. This, it is argued, was borrowed and adapted by Christian authors and is reflected particularly in II.2:3ff., Revelation and later Christian literature

- (b) suggesting the Antichrist legend is a later anthropomorphic transformation of the Dragon myth<sup>149</sup>.

To support this theory he provides a wealth of material from Daniel; Sibyls II and III; The Ascension of Isaiah chps. 3,4; 4 Ezra 5:1ff.; II Bar. 36-40; T.Dan. 5:6; Revelation, passim; The Apocalypse of Ezra; The Apocalypse of Zephaniah and many Patristic writers. From these he deduces the content of the secret tradition.

- (a) Antichrist's name is Belial or Beliar (cf. II Cor. 6:15; Asc.Is. 4:2). He is a false Messiah (Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. V.25:3)<sup>150</sup>.
- (b) He originates from the tribe of Dan. (Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. V.30:2)<sup>151</sup>.
- (c) He sits in the Temple of Jerusalem (Asc.Is. 4:6,11; II.2:4; Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. V.30:4) and appeals to unbelieving Jews, who have rejected the true Messiah (II.2:9-12)<sup>152</sup>.
- (d) He performs many wonders and signs (S.Or. III.64)<sup>153</sup>.
- (e) He is slain by Messiah (II.2:8)<sup>154</sup>.

Although at first sight the theory appears impressive it lacks conclusive proof for the following reasons

- (1) There is no evidence for an oral or written secret Antichrist tradition among the Jews<sup>155</sup>.

- (2) Although the Anomos may be a religious Antichrist, a tradition found elsewhere<sup>156</sup>, it does not follow that the tradition only concerned a religious figure? Bousset notes the very strong political setting in Revelation and other places<sup>157</sup>.
- (3) We have found no undisputed pre-Pauline equation of Beliar and Antichrist.
- (4) He has ignored the evidence provided by historical antecedents. There is no positive reference to Antiochus IV, Pompey or Caligula (on the latter he denies any connection between the Emperor's action and II.2:3f)<sup>158</sup>.
- (5) Beliar may be the mythical figure of the Dragon metamorphosed in to a wicked angel who becomes ruler of ethereal regions and prince of this world<sup>159</sup> but there is no hint of the Dragon = Antichrist through a link with the Beliar myth.

In the course of his work Bousset has provided interesting information about the development of the Antichrist idea from the Pauline Anomos onwards, but in our opinion has not substantiated any secret Antichrist tradition<sup>160</sup>.



## II Historical Antecedents

Charles' views on the subject were first presented in The Ascension of Isaiah; he later modified them, particularly the earlier part of the synthesis, in his commentary on The Book of Revelation. We now summarize his views as found in the latter. The idea of Antichrist first appears in Daniel and two lines of thought can be distinguished.

### (a) A God-opposing Individual

Dan. 11:36,40; 7:25; 'the Abomination of Desolation' references. The Antichrist idea, although impersonated in Antiochus and perhaps existing earlier, became disassociated from the historical Antiochus to become a permanent expectation in Judaism. Cf. Ps.Sol.; Caligula; II Bar. 36:5; 39:3; 4 Ezra 5:6<sup>161</sup>.

### (b) A Collective Interpretation<sup>162</sup>

(i) Secular Origin: Dan. 7:7f., 19f.; S.Or. III 388-400; As.Mos. 10:8; 4 Ezra 12:11f.; Rev. 13 and 17.

(ii) Religious Origin: I Jn. 2:18,22; 4:3; II Jn. 7.

Antichrist is a collective name for false teachers.

Concerning Beliar, he agrees with Bousset that through the myth the Dragon saga has gained its entrance<sup>n</sup> into Jewish and Christian eschatologies<sup>163</sup>. By the close of the 2nd century B.C. Beliar is only a satanic spirit but in the T. XII his functions appear similar to those of Satan. Paul in II.2:3ff. has taken this myth and fused it with the Antichrist myth to make Antichrist a God-opposing man armed with miraculous powers.

The Anomos however has religious significance only. Perhaps the same fusion is present in T.Dan. 5:6 and Rev. 13:11-17 (but not 13:1-10,17 which is wholly political) Antichrist is a purely Satanic power in Rev. 11:7,18; cf. II Cor. 6:15 (?) and As.Mos. 10:1,3 (?). Eventually the Antichrist and Nero redivivus myths <sup>u</sup> this were fused, Rev. 13:1,2; 17:8,11, and fused again with the Beliar myth in various degrees and forms S.Or. III.63-74 (with the thought of Nero alive); V.28-34, .214-217; VIII.88, 157 (with Nero redivivus); and Asc.Is. 4:2-4 (with Nero dead)<sup>164</sup>.

Charles appears to have produced a well-supported account of the way in which the Antichrist theme has developed from the time of Daniel onwards. Perhaps that is part of its weakness - it is too systematic on the paucity of evidence available, and bearing in mind that as yet the DSS have not produced anyone who could be reasonably identified with Antichrist. A great deal of the literature he refers to is Christian or has been influenced by Christianity (e.g. Asc.Is.; S.Or.; Rev.), and we must be extremely careful how we assess it for Jewish beliefs. Historical antecedents (above all Antiochus IV), which he mentions, have probably played a part in the creation (or perhaps evolution) of the idea. His supposition that a fusion between the Antichrist and Beliar myths has influenced the Pauline Anomos is not well-founded. Not only is Beliar not mentioned but Satan is only described in relation to 'the Man of lawlessness'; there is no identification<sup>165</sup>. Also if, as we believe, Daniel 11:36 and Antiochus IV lie behind Paul's conception, we cannot describe the Anomos in purely religious terms as Charles does<sup>166</sup>.

Through these comments our own position regarding the Anomos figure has begun to emerge and for the sake of clarity we shall express our conclusions in the following remarks.

(1) We must beware of understanding the Anomos in purely religious terms. It is true that the passage does not bear any explicit political traits but by its association with Dan. 11:36 it is possible political overtones are present<sup>167</sup>.

(2) Is.14:13,14; Ezek. 28:2 (possibly Gen. 3:5 since we have argued this lies behind these two O.T. texts and ἑξῆς καὶ τὸ II.2:3) and Dan. passim are the basic sources for the content of the idea. The idea itself has, as Charles has said, arisen from the actions of Antiochus IV cf. particularly Dan. 11:36, 40-45). When and how it is difficult to say.

(3) There is no reliable evidence from Judaism which suggests that the Antichrist belief arose in that milieu. It is more than likely that it is a development within Christianity.

The reason for this supposition is that whilst Christianity found many eschatological traits and signs in the O.T. and Judaism (e.g. lawlessness prior to the End)<sup>168</sup> which could be used in Christian eschatological thought, there was no personal opponent which could be set over against the returning Messiah. It would seem therefore that Christianity has developed and translated historical figures or their characteristics into a Final Adversary of Christ. Is Paul

then its creator? This is unlikely for we have already noted that Paul uses earlier tradition in the eschatological sections of his first letter to the Thessalonians (1:9f.; 2:14-16; 4:15 'word of the Lord'; 5:4 'the thief imagery') and should no doubt regard the Anomos as part of the same pre-Pauline eschatology. There is no reason why the conception of Antichrist should not have come at a very early stage since the idea of the Parousia must have had very early roots for it to have become such an important part of Christian teaching by the time Paul wrote I<sup>169</sup>.

Can we detect any other early examples of an Anti-christ figure? The only passage which may contain a reference occurs in Mk.13:14<sup>170</sup> where we have already noted that the masculine participle follows the expression 'Abomination of Desolation', 'Ὅταν δὲ ἴδῃτε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως ἐσθηκότες οὐ δεῖ', cf. Mt. 24:15; ἔσθ' ὅς ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ. The passage does not state clearly that the 'he' is a final opponent of the End-time<sup>171</sup>. Although there is an eschatological setting to vv.14ff. (which must have originally stood together)<sup>172</sup> the fact that there is still time for flight from danger suggests this could not have happened if it were the final End<sup>173</sup>. Also the phrase 'let the reader understand', which probably refers to a matter too dangerous to speak about openly<sup>174</sup>, would have no significance if the End followed on immediately. Flight to safety is only one of 'the things coming to pass' ( τὰ ὅσα γινόμενα ), 13:29. So whoever 'he' might be, there is no implicit thought of Antichrist.

On the other-hand we have the personalising of a phrase which was linked to the profane activity of Antiochus IV as described in Daniel<sup>175</sup>, and it is Dan. 11:36 which has influenced the description of the Pauline figure. So it could be that the 'he' of Mk. 13:14 does describe a coming figure similar to Antiochus and to that extent is an outstanding opponent of Christ.

Is there then any literary connection between Mk. 13 and II.2? A careful study of the two chapters<sup>176</sup> indicates the following:

II.2:1ff:

Mark 13

(a) Similar words

v.1 ἐπισυνάγωγῃς	v.27 ἐπισυνάξει (ἐπισυνάξουσιν). <sup>177</sup>
v.2 μὴ δὲ θροεῖσθαι	v.7 μὴ θροεῖσθε (same).
v.9 σημεῖοις...τέρασιν	v.22 σημεῖα...τέρατα (same).

(b) Similar ideas

v.3a No one deceive you	= v.5
v.4 In God's temple	= v.14
v.10,11 Deceiving by signs	= v.22

(c) Parallels outside II.2:1ff.

I.1:6; 3:3,7, θλίψις	= 13:19
I.4:17, ἐν νεφέλαις	= 13:26
I.5:1, 'times & seasons'	= 13:32
I.5:3, ἐκ φύγωσιν	= 13:14
I.5:3, τῇ ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούῃ	= 13:17
I.5:3, αἰφνίδιος	= 13:36 (but cf. Lk. 21:34).

I.5:6,10, γρηγοροῦμεν	= 13:35
I.5:6, καθεύδοντες	= 13:36
I.5:17,25, προσεύχεσθε	= 13:18
II.1:4,6, ἐν θλίψει	= 13:19
II.1:7, μετ' ἀγγέλων συν.	= 13:26

The evidence is not as impressive as it might look. Parallels in the third category are for the most part rather forced. Also if the evidence presented in Rigaux is carefully appraised<sup>178</sup> it does seem that II.2:1ff. could have some connection with the tradition of the Synoptic Apocalypse in Matthew (II.2:3,7, ἀνομία = 24:12; 2:10 σωθῆναι = 24:13) and other references outside of II.2 (e.g. I.5:7 = 24:48f.)<sup>179</sup>. It would be wrong therefore, to assert that Paul knew or used the Markan form of the Synoptic Apocalypse, whether in literary or oral form. If the part of the Synoptic discourse we are concerned with, v.14ff., was in circulation prior to Paul (irrespective of the suggested origin at the time of Caligula)<sup>180</sup> then it is possible he drew upon its sentiments for his view of a future Anomos: possibly the personalisation of the Abomination suggested the Man of Lawlessness. However with so little evidence available we may have to consider a different channel for the idea, quite apart from Mk. 13<sup>181</sup>. In our view the overriding reason for the development of the Antichrist was to set a figure over against Christ, prior to the End, who would sum up all opposition to the role of God and then be destroyed. This, we suspect, would be found in traditional primitive Christian teaching on eschatological matters.



(4) We regard all attempts to define the Anomos in terms of a Pseudo-Messiah<sup>182</sup> as futile. He appears as (i) a future figure (ii) a worker of 'miracles' (iii) the antithesis of Christ (iv) The Final Opponent before the End. His purpose is to deceive those who have rejected the truth and to claim worship as god but his doom is certain. If there is any implication within our passage it is that this Anomos cannot be located within a religious group but must be regarded as a world-wide deceiver. He sets himself above all deity.

(5) Whilst we find the origin of the Antichrist in primitive Christian eschatological thought and derived, at least in part, from Daniel we also consider that the theme of Satanic possession has contributed to the development of an Anomos inspired by Satan. This is not ~~to be~~ unexpected. We have traced the thought of Beliar in Jewish literature to provide the background for the third section of our study on Antichrist. With the growth in belief of Beliar or Satan as chief of spirits and deceiver of men it is probable that we should find texts which develop the idea of Satan possessing, indwelling and controlling men. If the early church was inspired by the profane acts of Antiochus in its conception of Antichrist, with its belief in Satan there was bound to be some connection of the two ideas. To some extent we see the same sort of thing at Qumran where Beliar, a term now referring to a person, has a relationship with his 'lot', the sons of darkness, 1QS 2:5.

### III SATANIC POSSESSION: THE NATURE OF THE ANOMOS

In this section we shall attempt to show that there is another area which may provide a clue to understanding the Anomos. We shall be concerned particularly with texts which deal with special relationships which Satan has with men.

The starting point is the statement in II.2:9; οὕτως (i.e. the parousia of the Anomos) ἐστὶν ἡ παρουσία κατ' ἐνέργειαν τοῦ Σατανᾶ.<sup>183</sup> Two points arise from this. (a) Satan is distinct from the Anomos and (b) Satan is inextricably linked with his agent. The second is bound up with the word ἐνέργεια. The figure's coming and presence is according to Satan's ἐνέργεια. What does this word mean here? The verb has occurred in 2:7, τὸ μυστήριον ἥδη ἐνεργεῖται τῆς ἀνομίας, and the noun occurs again in 2:11, πέμπει ... ὁ θεὸς ἐνέργειαν πλάνης. Apart from the use of ἐνέργεια in our passage, it occurs six times in Pauline letters<sup>184</sup>. In each case the word is related to God (which makes one suppose we have another example of Satan's counter-activity to Christ). The word is very similar in use to that of μυστήριον. It denotes 'activity', 'working' or 'operation', but because of its association with θεός or Χριστός it assumes the thought of divine power. What kind of power is understood from the word and its context? Phil. 3:21 speaks of Jesus Christ who will transform bodies of humiliation into glorious ones according to the ἐνέργεια which enables him to subject all things to himself. Certainly creative power is in view, but more than this too. The last clause, ὑποτάξαι

αὐτῷ (V.1. αὐτῷ 81: ἐαυτῷ K L pc)  
 τὰ πάντα, is introduced by κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν  
 τοῦ δυνάσθαι αὐτὸν. Together this speaks of a  
 power which subjugates and masters in order to do its will;  
 a power of possession. In Eph. 1:19 the δύνάμις of  
 God is for us, who now believe, and it is effected by the  
 inward possessing activity which proceeds from this strength,  
 κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ.  
 This type of power is illustrated in relation to the exalta-  
 tion of Christ, 1:20ff. The same possessing and subjugating  
 power is at work in Paul, Eph. 3:7, to the end that he will  
 make all men to see. The same overtones are present in the  
 verb, as in Phil. 2:13, 'For it is God who works (ἐνεργῶν)  
 in you to will and to do ...'<sup>185</sup>; God is active by his  
 possessing power which operates within the individual causing  
 him to follow God's will and carry it out.

It is also interesting to note the associations  
 that the ἐνεργέω word group has. In Hellenistic  
 papyri it is connected to magical powers, whilst in the  
 Wisdom of Solomon and Maccabees it is related to divine or  
 demoniac powers<sup>186</sup>. In the N.T. this association with  
 spiritual forces is continued with ἐνεργέω in the Active  
 Voice. Eight times it is related to God<sup>187</sup>, once to Satan<sup>188</sup>,  
 and three times to miraculous, or better, supernatural forces<sup>189</sup>.  
 In fact it is only ever used in connection with spiritual  
 powers. This cannot be mere coincidence and it is little  
 wonder that Clark<sup>190</sup> has translated the Active with 'to infuse  
 with supernatural spirit', (i.e. spirit possession). With  
 regard to Mt. 14:2 = Mk. 6:14; Phil. 2:13<sub>a</sub> we should read, in

his opinion, as though possession had taken place already.

He finds it more difficult to translate the verbal form, ἐνεργεῖσθαι<sup>191</sup>, in the same way. Out of its nine occurrences only twice does he render it 'to be infused'. The rest are translated 'to be made supernaturally operative'<sup>192</sup>. It is probably best to regard the form - εἶσθαι as denoting "the efficiency of divine power", and to agree with Clark that the Active Voice, and we would add from our study, the noun, can by way of context and usage denote 'possession'.

We can see how this applies to the Anomos. The idea of 'possession' quite naturally suits the context. The parousia of the figure is by Satan's possession, which must imply that Satan owns and controls him, so that his evil period continues<sup>193</sup>. Similarly in 2:11, the emphasis lies not on the active nature of the error, ἐνέργειαν πλάνης, but its deluding force. It possesses and grips the minds of the apostates so that they accept The Lie. If Paul had wanted to convey 'the work of Satan' in producing the Anomos he could have used τὸ ἔργον or a verbal form of ἐργάζομαι.

If the Antichrist figure is viewed in this way it raises the question of background for such a belief in Jewish and Christian thought.

#### 1. Satanic Possession in Jewish Thought

We must distinguish carefully between Satanic and demoniac possession, particularly as it features in the Gospels. N.T. demonism seems to regard the autonomy of man as completely annihilated or nearly so. The demoniac is so possessed by another(s) that he acts quite irrationally, cf. Mk. 5:1-5,9;

9:18-20<sup>194</sup>. The Anomos in II.2:9ff. appears to act rationally, with a calculated deliberateness aimed at deceiving by all manner of means, yet under Satan's control. He possesses the figure. A parallel is seen in the way the Spirit is said to indwell the Christian, Rom. 8:9,11; Gal. 5:16,18,25.

We can start with Qumran material. In the Damascus Document we read that

Every man who preaches apostasy under the dominion of the spirits of Satan shall be judged according to the law relating to those possessed by a ghost or familiar spirit, (Vermes)<sup>195</sup>.

The following comments can be made.

(a) The reference relates to Lev. 20:27 where the M.T. uses the expression 'has ( רוח ) a familiar spirit'.

(b) The CD text has an interesting word, לְבָשׁוּ from לָבַשׁ which can mean 'rule', 'have dominion' or 'have power'. For the last of these meanings cf. Ex. 21:8. The verse runs literally, 'Every man, whom the spirits of Belial (= Satan of Vermes' translation) have power over' i.e. control. It is under their direction that a man preaches apostasy.

(c) In the Scrolls there is no suggestion of spirits as bodiless beings in need of a habitation. They are to be regarded probably as fallen angels who share intimately with Belial in his work, cf. IQM. 13:11f.; 13:2,4<sup>196</sup>.

(d) There is no equation of 'Belial' with 'Satan' in the Scrolls. However the kind of activity which the former displays makes it likely the two are synonymous<sup>197</sup>.

(e) We do not find Belial himself possessing the preacher of apostasy but we come close to the idea<sup>198</sup>.

In Jubilees 1:20 Moses prays that 'the spirit of Beliar should not rule over them to accuse them before thee'. We approach the idea of possession, but the terms are too general for a close analogy with II.2. However we can readily see how this statement could be developed in the direction of individual possession.

We have a similar idea in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs. T.Reub. 4:11, 'if fornication does not overcome the mind, neither can Belial overcome (κατισχύσει) you, i.e. cannot possess you. T.Iss. 6:1, κολληθήσονται τῇ ἀπληστίᾳ τῷ βελιάρ is set in parallel with κολληθήσονται τῷ βελιάρ. Obviously the emphasis is on the activity of the children of Issachar in the last days. The verb used indicates a close unity between two things, cf. Bauer, 'enter into a close relation with'<sup>199</sup>. T.Dan. 4:7, 'When the soul is continually disturbed the Lord departeth from it, and Beliar ruleth over it' (καὶ κυριεύσει αὐτῆς ὁ βελιάρ)<sup>200</sup>, cf. 3:6 where we have the name Satan. In this text (i.e. 4:7) we find a close parallel in Jn. 13:2,7 and II.2:9. T.Naph. 8:6, καὶ ὁ διάβολος οἰκτιροῦται αὐτὸν ὡς ἴδιον σκεῦος. The reference is to a man 'who does not that which is good'. Here we have a clear example of Satanic possession<sup>201</sup>. Of course there is the problem of the dating



of the texts, but all the examples given appear to be situated in a Jewish framework.

In the Ascension of Isaiah<sup>202</sup> we have a clear statement on our theme. 2:1; 'Sammael settled upon (abode in: Charles<sup>203</sup>) Manasseh and clung fast to him'. In 1:9 we read 'Beliar will dwell in Manasseh'. Are Beliar and Sammael one and the same person? 1:11 speaks of 'The design of Sammael against Manasseh' which seems to suggest they are identified (and also with Satan, 2:2,7). 1:8 could imply the two are distinct, 'Sammael Malkira will serve Manasseh and execute all his desires, and he will be a follower of Beliar'. This possession led to lawlessness (ἀνομία 2:4,8), apostasy (ἀποστασία 2:4), witchcraft, magic, fornication and so on. Here then we have a very decisive text.

The references may be only few in comparison with other subjects but the intertestamental period saw the development of so much in the whole realm of angelology, demonology, Satan (Beliar) and eschatology. There is no clear systematic teaching on subjects. The texts we have cited are the seeds of thought which have advanced considerably in the N.T.. These references, we suggest, provide the platform for later development and insight.

This development is itself part of a growth which has its roots in the O.T. and beyond (e.g. in Persian circles). I Sam. 16:14,16 records that Yahweh sent an evil spirit to trouble Saul. This took possession of him for periods of time, 16:23<sup>204</sup>. Later this belief acquired a new shape. God remained sovereign but other agencies carried out his will, even if contrary to their will. In II Sam. 24:1, the Lord

moved David to number Israel but in I Chron. 21:1 it is The Adversary or Satan<sup>205</sup> who causes it. The same Hebrew and Greek verbs are used in each place, שָׂטָן , LXX ἐκέσεισεν<sup>206</sup>. On both occasions David's action is treated as sin and chastised. By the time of I Enoch 6-36 all sin can be ascribed to Azazel; Greek, καὶ ἐκ' αὐτοῦ γράψον τὰς ἀρκαρίας πάσας<sup>207</sup>. The belief in a close union between Satan (or his Spirits) and a man has no doubt also replaced those passages which deal with the spirit of God coming upon men of ill-intent, as is the case with Balaam and Saul<sup>208</sup>. Later it is such men who are indwelt by Beliar. This kind of process can be seen at work in the canonical book of Job and the Testament of Job, which in our estimation, is a Jewish work probably of the pre-Christian era<sup>209</sup>. In Job 32 Elihu appears very abruptly. The three friends have found it impossible to argue Job out of his 'righteous' position, Elihu comes on the scene at this precise moment and works up his wrath against Job. However by the time of T. Job Elihu's action is explained in terms of Satanic possession and inspiration. XLI:5, τότε Ἐλίου ἐμπνευσθεὶς ἐν τῷ Σατανᾷ ἐξεῖπέν μοι λόγους θρασείας.

Two things are of interest to us here.

1. The word denoting Satan's connection to Elihu is expressed by ἐμπνέω<sup>210</sup> followed by ἐν<sup>211</sup>. Satan<sup>212</sup> has breathed his being into the man, so as to speak words through Elihu to Job. The ἐμπνέω denotes too, not merely 'inspiration' but possession. That the writer (or editor) of the Midrash understood it in this way seems clear from XLII:2, where the Lord says of Elihu, μὴ εἶναι ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ θηρίον.

By wild beast is almost certainly meant 'spirit possession'<sup>213</sup>. Elihu is regarded as dominated by Satan so that he comes to love the beauty of the Serpent<sup>214</sup> and the scales of the Dragon. The three friends in the story are forgiven their ἀνομία<sup>215</sup>, but Elihu<sup>216</sup> is destined for darkness; 'his glory will be swallowed up in darkness', οἱ δὲ θυρωροὶ τῆς σκοτίας κληρονομήσουσιν αὐτοῦ τὴν δόξαν XLIII:6<sup>217</sup>.

Even if James was right in placing this book in the second century A.D., he admits that it was the work of a Jewish Christian based on a Hebrew Midrash. It is amazing that this author has left hardly any Christian traces in the work. The whole work reflects Jewish ideas, with Satan clearly defined but still far from the spiritual enemy depicted in the N.T.

2. The second matter which has a bearing on Satanic possession and II, occurs with the expression ἐξεῖπεν μοι λόγους θρασεῖς. θραδύς (bold) is used frequently in a bad sense, i.e. 'rash' or 'arrogant'<sup>218</sup>. However in this context and others it comes to mean 'blasphemous words'. This is the reason for Elihu remaining unforgiven. He has displayed wilful ignorance of God's ways and blasphemed God at the same time. Speaking 'hard words' is by no means an unique phrase. I En. 1:9, God comes 'to convict all flesh ... of all the hard things which ungodly sinners have spoken against him'<sup>219</sup>, (καὶ σκληρῶν ὧν ἐλάλησαν λόγοι cf. Jude 15 where this text is quoted); 1 En. 5:4, 'But you have turned away and spoken proud and harsh words with your impure mouths against His greatness', κατελάλησατε μεγάλους καὶ σκληροὺς λόγους

cf. 27:2; 98:7,8; 101:3<sup>220</sup>. Perhaps this has been borrowed from Daniel, where the text concerns a mouth speaking 'great things', 7:8,11,20. The same feature occurs much later in Rev. 13: The Satanic Beast blasphemes, v.5f. In Dan. 11:36 (cf. II.2:4) the king will speak 'marvellous things against the God of gods', LXX, ἐξ ἁλλὰ λαλήσει Theod., λαλήσει ὑπέρογκα.

The Testament of Job furnishes us with interesting insights into Satanic activity and provides a basis for understanding II.2:4, in particular the phrase 'proclaiming he is God' and 2:9, the ἐνέργειαι of Satan.

### Conclusions

1. In the O.T. we have spirit possession from God which was later to be attributed to Satan.
2. There are examples of people possessed by Satan or his spirits in intertestamental literature.
3. The precise nature of the 'possession' is not defined in psychological terms; it is stated as a fact.
4. A distinction must be made between demon possession as seen in the Gospels and the type of possession of which we are talking.

## 2. Satanic Possession in Christian Thought

As with the Qumran community, the church of the first century saw their faith against a background of the war between God and his hosts and the Devil and his. The conflict is played out in the hearts and minds of men. Satan's desire is to ensnare people and make them sons of darkness. God's aim is to free them from the kingdom of darkness and establish them in the kingdom of His son. Into this framework the Anomos fits. He is the last part of Satan's plan to blind and deceive men, and because of his extraordinary powers he is partially successful. It appears that this human figure, is also possessed by Satan's energy.

This is the general background of thought to II.2:9ff. Are there, we must ask, any other examples of men possessed in this way in the N.T.? A number of texts appear to be relevant; Jn. 6:70; 8:44; 13:2,27; Lk. 22:3; Acts 5:3; Rev. 13. The references in John's Gospel indicate how a different approach is used by the writer in making Satan entirely responsible for evil. As W. Foerster writes,

with man's consent it (i.e. the yoke of Satan) leads to a connection with him which John especially describes in terms which denote a natural inter-relation of being though not according to the natural law as in Gnosticism<sup>221</sup>.

In Jn. 6:70 Jesus, in speaking to the Twelve, says οὐκ ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς τοὺς δώδεκα ἐξελεξάμην; καὶ ἐς ὑμῶν εἷς διάβολος ἐστίν. The mention of Judas as a devil<sup>222</sup> is interpreted by the writer in the next verse. Clearly he understood it to mean that he was such in the light of sub-

sequent conduct and events. His act of betrayal is the main reason for the application of this word to him, cf. 13:2. Judas is no mere enemy or slanderer; both words do not do justice to the thought. Judas is a 'devil' because of his association with the Devil. The act of treachery comes from the innermost circle of the followers of Jesus, εἰς (ὧν)<sup>223</sup> ἐκ τῶν δωδέκα . This phrase has affinities with the Synoptic tradition, cf. Lk. 22:3,47; Mt. 26:14,17; Mk. 14:10,43, and it may well be that we have here older material concerning Judas, (pre-Lukan?). We can leave this for the moment. All we need note is the description of Judas and the link between him and the Devil; a union of intent and purpose. Probably Jesus does not mean that Judas is now a devil, but rather, he will be, (cf. the use of ἐπελκεν in 6:71 which apparently points to the future).

Jn. 13:2 and 27 explain how Judas became a devil. We start with 13:27 since there are no textual problems: τότε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς ἐκεῖνον ὁ Σατανᾶς . Virtually the same expression is used in Lk. 22:3, εἰσῆλθεν δὲ Σατανᾶς εἰς Ἰούδαν τὸν καλούμενον Ἰσκαριώτην, ὄντα ἐκ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τῶν δώδεκα <sup>224</sup>. The τὸν καλ. κ.τ.λ. may be a Lukanism, (Lk. 22:47) or borrowed from earlier tradition. The ὄντα ἐκ κ.τ.λ. is probably derived from Mark (14:10,43) or, as it is paralleled in John (6:70f.), from a tradition concerned with Judas and his act of betrayal. Either way after removing these two statements we are left with an almost identical expression as <sup>6</sup> that in Jn. 13:27. The two Gospels share the same idea, that Judas acted as he



did because of Satanic possession<sup>225</sup>. Both Gospels see the Passion as a struggle waged against the arch-enemy of God, the ruler of this world<sup>226</sup>. Judas becomes an important pawn in the struggle for victory over Christ. The entry of Satan into Judas denotes more than 'inspiration' to action. Jn. 13:2 discounts this possibility. Satan takes up residence so as to guide the man to fulfil his wishes<sup>227</sup>. We ought to note the use of the verb εἰσέρχομαι. This verb is used of demons, Mk. 9:25; Lk. 8:30, 32f.; 5:12f. Although we do not have demon possession in John (or Luke), the use of a verb which described the activity of demons is most appropriate to describe the activity of the ruler of demons.

The thought of Jn. 13:2 is fairly clear but the verse is surrounded by textual problems. We quote the Nestle text; τοῦ διαβόλου ἡδὴ βεβληκότος εἰς τὴν καρδίαν ἵνα παραδοῖ αὐτὸν Ἰούδας Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτης.

(a) We reject the Syriac<sup>s</sup> and few Old Latin MSS text, 'Satan entered into' as a harmonization with Luke 22:3 or John 13:27.

(b) The reading Ἰσκαριώτου is read by many MSS; A K L Δ Θ Π Ψ pl. many versions. This is accepted by U.B.S. text. For the Nestle reading, p<sup>66</sup> 2 B. lat<sup>228</sup>. Whichever is correct, for our purposes the sense of the text is unaffected.

(c) If ἵνα παραδοῖ αὐτὸν is transposed after Ἰσκαριώτου, A K Δ Θ Π then there is no doubt as to the fact that Satan put the desire into Judas's heart to betray Christ; cf. D e Ἰούδας Σιμ. ἀπὸ καρπῶτου ἵνα παρ. αὐτὸν. <sup>229</sup>.

(d) The  $\lambda \beta$  yields the more difficult reading in that we can take it to mean Satan had recently made up his mind that it should be Judas who would betray Christ<sup>230</sup>. However it need not be understood in this way for these reasons.

i. In view of Jn. 13:27; cf. 6:70,71 the plan appears to have been formulated earlier than this. At least this is how the author appears to see it.

ii. It is a strange way of saying that the Devil had determined to do something inside himself. Why not add  $\xi\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$  or use another verb  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\omega, \delta\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma\omega$  <sup>231</sup>.

iii. We need an explanation at this point of why Judas acted as he did. The desire had been placed and was present.

So whether we follow the  $\lambda \beta$  text or the clear A D K text we can come to the same conclusion. At this point in the gospel the author wants to explain that the thought of betrayal was in Judas, having been put there by the Devil. It is interesting to compare this narrative with Luke. In Lk. 22:3 Satan entered into Judas so that he went to the priests. In John we have a two fold stage. The first is implied by 13.2 and the second in 13:27. Three points emerge from 13:2

(a) The thought or desire to betray is implanted in the  $\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$  of Judas<sup>232</sup>.

(b) The temptation has been accepted. The 'not all are clean' implies this, 13:11.

- (c) Surrender to this leads to Satanic domination until the desired end is reached, cf.

T.Naph. 8:6<sup>233</sup>.

The thought of this text can be contrasted with demonic possession in the Synoptic Gospels. Best<sup>234</sup> has demonstrated that the emphasis of this sort of possession lies on the a-moral affect produced; physical and mental and, we might add, psychological. Demons appear to enter uninvited, Lk. 11:26, in their desperate search for a physical habitation. On the other hand, Satan seeks for men who want to accept and obey his will.

Another interesting passage occurs in Jn. 8:44, where Jesus is described as speaking to Jews who have just believed on him, vv.30, 31a. Jesus goes on to explain the nature of discipleship and its consequences; truth will set them free, vv.31, 32. They remonstrate with him saying that they have never known bondage. They argue that their spiritual origin lies in Abraham their ancestor. They are his children, v.33f. Jesus disregards their view and states categorically that ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστὲ καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν θέλετε ποιεῖν. The reason for this is twofold.

- i. They had hostile intentions towards him, in spite of their apparent faith, v.40.
- ii. Their hostile intentions had arisen upon their refusal of the truth, v.40b; in particular his reference to freedom from sin, vv.32ff.

It is the author's view that Jesus can perceive the hidden thoughts of individuals (2:25; cf. 1:48; 5:42; 16:30; 6:61,64) and we have one more example in this passage. The words of Jesus seem aimed at provoking a Jewish reaction in order to reveal this group of so-called believers as agents of the ἀνθρωποκτόνος<sup>235</sup>. As an aside it is worthwhile noting that this group in Jn. 8 and Judas are treated as 'believers' yet they contain the seeds of apostasy which become evident when exposed to view. They are shown to be controlled by the Devil. They are out of (ἐκ) the Devil, v.44, not ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, v.47. It is their will (θέλετε) ποιεῖν the lusts of their father. In selecting this piece of tradition the author not only shows agreement with the Judas story but his belief in Satanic control and possession.

Whether there is a common author, editor or school behind the Gospel of John and the First Letter is unimportant. We certainly find I Jn. 3:8 in agreement with the sentiments already surveyed in the Gospel. Ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστίν. Once more we have the preposition ἐκ in the sense of 'belonging to' or 'united with', cf. Jn. 8:44<sup>236</sup>. The context is equally as instructive as John 8. The message of I Jn. 3 is addressed to the 'children of God', in order that they might be clear as to the distinction between true and false children, v.9. In 2:19f. we read of some who had left the community. In the next chapter 'John' explains why these apostates left. They are really children of the Devil because they commit sin, in spite of their alleged allegiance to Christ. Of course he does not deny

that Christians sin, 1:7ff., so this must imply something different<sup>237</sup>. The difference appears to be that because some belong to the devil, the way they sin directly reflects his authorship and control. The writer is not referring to the non-christian world but to a specific group who have rejected the truth, 2:22f., and tried to deceive the Christian family, 2:26. However they should not be misled, 2:26, cf. II.2:3a. If the letter was written around the turn of the first century<sup>238</sup> then its purpose was to expose the ever-growing number of deviations from the truth. Some were already known, cf. I Tim. 4:1f., and inspired by lying spirits and demons. In this epistle exponents of 'heresy' were charged with being Satan's special agents. They claimed, perhaps sinlessness, 1:8, possession of the Spirit, 4:1, but they were sinners belonging to the Devil, antichrists, 2:19 and false prophets, 4:1.

Acts 5:3 contains an equally interesting statement on the subject<sup>239</sup>. Peter says, 'Ανκνία, δὲ τί ἐπλήρωσεν 240 ὁ Σατανᾶς τὴν καρδίαν σου; From this question we can comment upon the following features.

i. We have the term Σατανᾶς as Lk. 22:3 and Jn. 13:27. Also the word καρδία as Jn. 13:2.

ii. Πληρώω clearly denotes 'possession' and can be compared to the use of εἰσερχομαι

iii. Satan has not merely tempted, κειράζω, 5:9, but possessed him. This certainly seems to set in opposition to the 'filling' of the Spirit<sup>241</sup>.

iv. Ananias is another example of those who apparently adhered to the Christian faith but rejected and fell away from it<sup>242</sup>. Apostasy and Satanic control go together.

Finally we can look at Rev. 13. The first Beast comes as an agent of the Dragon = Satan, 12:9. To an unique degree he is endowed with latter's authority, 13:2, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ δράκων τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξουσίαν μεγάλην. 13:4, καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ δράκοντι ὅτι ἔδωκεν τὴν ἐξουσίαν τῷ θηρίῳ. People worship not only the Beast, but Satan, whom they perceive in the actions of the Beast. Here we have a later stage in the development of the Antichrist figure, but he bears the same characteristics as the Anomos of II.2. Also Satan and the Antichrist appear inextricably linked in Revelation.

We now return to have a general and brief look at Paul's teaching on the activity of Satan<sup>244</sup>. He is described as the Genesis tempter, Rom. 16:20; cf. II Cor. 11:2,3; see also I Tim. 2:14; Rev. 12:9; 20:2, but is above all the present tempter I Cor. 7:5; cf. I.3:5. He appears as an angel of light, II Cor. 11:14<sup>245</sup> and can hinder the servants of God, I.2:18; II Cor. 12:7. Christians are not to be taken in by his devices, II Cor. 2:11. The term διαβολος is found only in Ephesians (4:27; 6:11) and the three Pastoral Letters. If the former is Pauline then the two texts continue the thought of II Cor. 2:11. One passage which has some significance for our theme occurs in I Cor. 5:5. Paul commits a man to Satan by the power of the



risen Christ, 5:4 for the destruction of the flesh.

The text runs, *καταδοῦναι τὸν τοιοῦτον τῷ Σατανᾷ εἰς ὀλεθρὸν τῆς σαρκός*. Two points are worthy of attention:

i. Satan is the instrument for punishing sin. We can compare this with The Lie, II.2:10, who is God's judgment on future apostates.

ii. *Σάρξ* is not to be taken literally but figuratively. It is a reference to human nature which is corrupt, Rom. 7:18; 8:3b; Gal. 5:16; II Cor. 1:17; 10:2. So the ruin of the flesh (cf. I.5:3; II.1:9) is probably not an allusion to excommunication<sup>246</sup> leading to physical death<sup>247</sup>, but the destruction of the sinful nature which committed the sin.<sup>248</sup> How is this to be achieved? Perhaps Paul considered that an over-indulgence of the sexual appetite was the appropriate form of punishment. A similar expression is found in I Tim. 1:20, *παρέδωκα τῷ Σατανᾷ ἵνα πειθευθῶσιν ἢ βλασφημεῖν*. What is important is that this man is now in Satan's possession because of his own choice and sin.

Our study of *ἐνέργεια* and *ἐνεργέω* together with examples and references to Satanic possession have provided a background against which we can place the Anomos. We have argued that we should see the figure in a close relationship with Satan<sup>249</sup>. In nearly every N.T. case which we have looked at, the person(s) involved have been members of the Christian community. It may well be that Paul considered the Anomos to be an apostate. Perhaps that is the symbolic meaning of the Beast arising from the sea,

Rev. 13:1. It may recall the sea of glass before the throne, 4:6; 15:2, where 'those who overcome' will stand and which may suggest the sea is a symbol for the church<sup>250</sup>.

#### The Traditions-History of the Idea of Satanic Possession

We have investigated quite a few N.T. references. Does some of the material belong to the early tradition of the church? It has been acknowledged that John's gospel has affinities with the Synoptics<sup>251</sup>. This especially applies to Jn. 13:1-30 and in particular v.20ff. Barrett<sup>252</sup> seems inclined to believe that the Johannine tradition is derived from Lukan similarities but he does not provide any detail on the problem. Dodd<sup>253</sup>, Bultmann<sup>254</sup> and Wilcox<sup>255</sup> opt for oral traditions lying behind the Lukan and Johannine sections. Wilcox argues that 13:27a seems to conform to a traditional explanation of the betrayal which gives signs of an early date.. He is intrigued by the use of  $\Sigma\kappa\tau\alpha\sqrt{\alpha}\varsigma$  (only here in John) and the closeness to Lk. 22:3. Dodd is also inclined to think in this way. He considers it possible that John has the simpler tradition, over against Matthew and Mark, explaining Judas' action from diabolical inspiration. Later attempts, he writes, were made to rationalise it<sup>256</sup>. In our opinion it would be easier to regard the tradition behind Mk. (describing Judas' act) as the earliest material and the explanation of Satanic possession coming later when Judas' action was considered incomprehensible.

Conzelmann<sup>257</sup> argues that the Ananias passage, Acts 5, was written prior to Luke's use of the section. Lukan additions, he believes, point to this conclusion, even if there is no historical kernel. The historicity of Acts 5 and John 13 do not concern us. Our interest lies in these stories being current in early church tradition and showing that certain actions were explained in the way we have outlined.

In looking for connections between II and the story of Judas we may add the similar descriptions of the activity of Satan in the expression, ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας, Jn. 17:12; II.2:3.. Is this merely accidental? Most commentators on John and Thessalonians are content to note the other passage. Only Billings<sup>258</sup> seems to have made any attempt to connect the two. He argues that John regarded Judas as the already realised supernatural figure of the Anomos. Not only is this unlikely, and he gives no proof for it, but it comes dangerously close to identifying Judas and Satan.

All attempts to make Judas a basis for the Pauline Anomos seem doomed to failure. We may be able to trace Jn. 13:20ff. (perhaps 6:70,71 as well) prior to the final completion of Luke, but how far beyond that is uncertain. In Dodd's estimation - a long way. It is possible that the phrase ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας was applied at an early stage to Judas because he was regarded as a type or precursor of the Antichrist to come. We have already noted that the teaching about the Apostasy was part of Paul's missionary preaching and we must assume he came to this view (by what-

ever means) earlier than this; probably in the fifth decade of the first century. It is highly likely that traditions about Judas were numerous at the time, in their attempt to explain his action (cf. the traditions of his death, Mt. 27:3ff.; Acts 1:18ff.). It is quite possible that the two traditions (Antichrist and Judas) interacted. It is interesting that the description of Judas as an apostate, possessed by Satan and son of  $\delta\pi\omega\lambda\epsilon\iota\acute{\alpha}$  should so closely parallel the Pauline Anomos figure.

Confirmation of the fact that there was a Christian Antichrist tradition comes from I John. It is noteworthy that this Letter far from rejecting and re-interpreting the tradition uses it to show that present antichrists are only precursors of the Future One. The phrase is then added,  $\kappa\alpha\theta\omega\varsigma\ \eta\kappa\acute{o}\upsilon\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon$  , 2:18. Schnackenburg<sup>259</sup> comments that the author wants to link what he is writing to early Christian eschatological views and sets out the official understanding of the Antichrist tradition. One reason could be that just as the Parousia had apparently been delayed, so had the coming of the Antichrist. His delay is explained by the many antichrists. Their presence proves it is the Last Hour, and Christians can expect now the Antichrist himself, 2:18; 4:3.



There are a few considerations which suggest that we ought to modify the view and regard ἀπώλεια more in terms of a realm than a state.

1. Ἀπώλεια<sup>265</sup> within the Pauline Corpus is always placed in antithesis to salvation or a similar concept. This can be either stated or implied. In Rom. 9:22 there are vessels κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν<sup>266</sup> (cf. Is. 54:16 καὶ ἐκφέρων σκεῦος εἰς ἔργον and for the idea Prov. 16:4; I Pet. 2:8), which are contrasted with vessels προητοίμασεν εἰς δόξαν, v.23. The glory to be expected is mentioned in 8:18ff. It appears to be not only a new state of being but a new realm which Christians will enter. In Phil. 1:28 ἀπώλεια is in opposition to σωτηρία. Here again it is impossible to eradicate both state and realm. The salvation of the community consists of future salvation in a realm in which freedom from adversity can be enjoyed and all the realm affords. A little later on in 3:19 we read that one style of life leads to ἀπώλεια but the other involves waiting for the Saviour who brings citizenship in heaven. The contrast is between ἀπώλεια and heaven, vv.19,20.

2. In the LXX we find the Greek word translating שְׁאוֹל<sup>267</sup> four times and possibly five, (see Prov. 27:20, in parallel with Sheol) Job 26:6; Prov. 15:11 it occurs with Sheol ( ἄδης : שְׁאוֹל ), Ps. 87 (88):12 with Grave ( τάφος : שְׁאוֹל ). Job 28:22 with Death ( θάνατος : מוֹת ; both are personified). Job 31:12, immortality is a fire that leadeth to Abaddon<sup>268</sup>.



The LXX has a different reading, a paraphrase with the verb ἀπολλύει . Prov. 27:20, both ὁ δαίμων for Sheol, and ἀπώλεια (for Abaddon?) are personified.

Abaddon only occurs in the Wisdom Literature and then a few times, but enough for us to suggest that the book of Revelation has used the term for the name of a demoniac angel, 9:11<sup>269</sup>. This name is then equated with the Greek name, Ἀπολλύων (Destroyer). The O.T. term denotes apparently the underworld realm<sup>270</sup>. The use of ἀπώλεια by the LXX translators suggests that they understood it in the same way, at least in the Wisdom Literature<sup>271</sup> even if they used it for other Hebrew words. Hanson<sup>272</sup> has given good reasons for believing that Paul was well acquainted with Job. In which case there is no difficulty in seeing Paul use the word for a realm, a place of ruin.

3. Paul uses a comparable Semitism in I.5:5, 'sons of light'; cf. Lk. 16:8; Jn. 12:36; see too Eph. 5:8; Lk. 10:6, 'son of peace' and in Qumran, 'sons of light', IQS. 1:9; 3:13,24; IQM.1:3 passim<sup>273</sup>. The context of Thessalonians, with its contrast of darkness and light motifs, echoes Amos 5:19ff. and the Day of the Lord concept. The genitive in this expression denotes relationship or membership of the light. Frame<sup>274</sup> is going too far when he says it means 'they belong to Christ', but that is the thought behind it. However we entirely agree with his comment on 'sons of day', which follows the other, I.5:5. He says that Christians belong to the realm of future light and salvation. The key word is 'day' in this phrase. It has already been used in I.5:2, 'Day of the Lord'

and 5:4, 'The Day'. Nearly all commentators agree that it is virtually equivalent to  $\kappa\alpha\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\acute{\alpha}$ . This equation is rejected for v.5 by Von Dobschütz and Rigaux<sup>275</sup>. Paul, they argue, has a word play here. Rigaux has difficulty in determining the precise nature of the word-play and tries to give the phrase as a whole the force of 'one who sees clearly, the other not'. The sons of day are sons of perception. This is not very appropriate in the case of v.6. Is Paul saying, 'You are sons of perception. Do not sleep'? Is it not better if we regard him as saying, v.5, 'You are all sons of light, sons of that day'? In other words 'You belong to the realm of light, you are sons who belong to (in a sense 'own') the Parousia day. Therefore keep awake, watch ... do not let it come suddenly upon you as a thief, v.4. Verse 8 seems to confirm this: 'We are of the Day. Be sober'. Rigaux is right in so far as he says

Paul met une distance entre être chrétien et ne pas l'être comme du jour a la nuit<sup>276</sup>.

The distance is defined by the total separation of the two realms to which each group belongs.

In view of these three points it is probable that Paul intended the Thessalonians to place the Anomos firmly in the sphere and realm of  $\alpha\tau\acute{\omega}\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha$ . His thought is not that the figure departs or is doomed to depart to Abaddon, but that he lives within, and belongs to, a destructive realm. He draws his power from within it. This is what makes him

so frightening. So we have a parallel with the Beast who arises from the abyss (as compared with the first Beast, Rev. 13:1, whom we suggested might arise from the church: also a realm) 17:8, guarded by the demoniac angel, 9:11. The Beast only comes by God's permission, when the doors, as it were, are opened to the world cf. Rev. 1:18; Wis. 16:13. In II.2, when the Katechon withdraws only then can the Anomos come. In the end the realm of evil, which has destroyed so much is swallowed up and destroyed, 20:1-3, 14<sup>277</sup>. We have argued therefore that in this phrase we have one further expression of the Satanic character of the figure to come. He is located within Satan's realm, the realm devoted to the ruin of everything but which will be suddenly overthrown, II.2:8.

This whole section has attempted to throw new light upon the background to the character of the Anomos. By looking at the use of the word ἐνέπυεῖν and studying Jewish and Christian examples of Satanic possession, we have sought to provide evidence for a growing understanding of this phenomenon. In addition to which we have looked at the phrase, 'son of ἀνωλεῖν' to show that it conveys the thought that Antichrist belongs to and is placed within this realm of Ruin. Judas similarly is a son of this realm.

#### IV. THE REVELATION, ACTIVITY, AND END OF THE ANOMOS

##### A. Revelation of the Anomos.

Too little attention has been paid to the occurrence of the word ἀποκαλύπτω in II.2:3<sup>278</sup>. It is used again in 2:6,8. Two of these three references relate clearly to the Anomos, vv.3,8. We shall argue that v.6 must also apply to this figure<sup>279</sup>. It is interesting that this short section vv.1-12, contains a triple use of ἐνέργεια (-έω), ἀνομία (-ος), and ἀποκαλύπτω. It certainly indicates a need to look at the precise meaning as well as the background of the last of these words.

Sirard<sup>280</sup> has attempted to parallel the verb with two other verbs, ἀναίρω and καταργέω, 2:8. These express the kind of ruin which awaits the Anomos. From this 'equation' and together with the legal nuance, which he claims is present in the verb 'reveal', we should translate, 'taken in judgment'. This, he feels, suits the aim of the whole pericope, which is to show the true sign of the End to be the fall of Satan's kingdom. As proof of his translation he refers to Jer. 11:20; Lam. 2:14 and texts signifying the discovering of nudity, e.g. Ex. 20:26. In the N.T. he refers to I Cor. 3:13; Lk. 2:35, where it is or becomes synonymous with δοκιμάζω: the verb is also in parallel with φανερώ, II Cor. 4:10,11; Col. 3:3; I Pet. 5:4; I Jn. 2:28; 3:2. Despite all this 'evidence', he seems to have failed to prove that ἀποκαλύπτω can have this meaning.

i. Even if ἀποκαλύπτω = δοκιμάζω , it only means 'tested' 'proved'.

ii. Texts may be in a legal context but that does not warrant seeing in them the idea of judgment. In Ex. 20:26 etc. the thought is of the actual uncovering of nudity, not of being taken in judgment.

iii. His theory of the Katechon seems to demand that he understands the verb in this way.

Our study will concern itself with an examination of the verb and its cognate noun, ἀποκάλυψις , in passages which suggest a disclosure, similar to that in our pericope. But before doing so we should look at the way the words are used in the LXX and N.T.

### LXX

We have a varied usage of the verb. It can be taken literally, Num. 5:18, uncovering hair; Ruth 3:4, uncovering feet; or figuratively, Ps. 36 (37):5, 'reveal thy way to the Lord'; Amos 3:7, God reveals his secret; Jer. 20:12, revealed the situation to God<sup>281</sup>. The noun is used once, I Kgdms. 20:30, nakedness (  $\overline{\pi\lambda\eta\gamma\eta}$  ).

### N.T.

Both verb and noun are used frequently to denote the revelation of truth or divine secrets, Mt. 11:25; Phil. 3:15 (for the verb); Rom. 16:25; Eph. 1:17; Gal. 1:12; 2:2 (for the noun).

These texts are not particularly helpful for II.2:3,6,8. All they show is the basic idea of something being uncovered and exposed. We shall look carefully therefore at two sets of texts. Those dealing with the thought of exposure of deeds and words and secondly, those set in an eschatological context.

(a) Exposure of deeds and words

Mt. 10:26, *Μὴ οὖν φοβηθῆτε αὐτοὺς· οὐδὲν γάρ ἐστιν κεκαλυμμένον ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται, καὶ κρυπτόν ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται*. Are we to think of a privately given message of Jesus, v.27, which will be exposed: *ἀποκαλυφθήσεται* in parallel with *γνωσθήσεται*? In the Lukan parallel, 12:2 we have the same text from *ὃ οὐκ κ.τ.λ.* (D reads *φανερωθήσεται*). It is a question in Luke of whether we infer the words of the disciples are to become public, 12:3, or assume that the hypocritical lives of the Pharisees will become exposed, 12:1, perhaps by the disciples' preaching<sup>282</sup>. Very similar statements are found in Mk. 4:22, *Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν τι κρυπτόν, ἐὰν μὴ ἵνα φανερωθῇ· οὐδὲ ἐγένετο ἀπόκρυφον, ἀλλ' ἵνα ἔλθῃ εἰς φανερόν* and Lk. 8:17, *Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν κρυπτόν ὃ οὐ φανερόν γενήσεται, οὐδὲ ἀπόκρυφον ὃ οὐ μὴ γνωσθῇ καὶ εἰς φανερόν ἔλθῃ*<sup>283</sup>. Apart from Lk. 12:2 in all the texts mentioned there is only the thought of bringing to light (exposing) what is now hidden. In Luke, however, there are possible overtones of judgment. Similar ideas are found in Rom. 2:16, 'judging the secrets of men' (*τὰ κρυπτὰ*) and I Cor. 4:5, *ὅς καὶ φωτίσει τὰ κρυπτὰ τοῦ σκοτούς*



καὶ φανερώσει τὰς βουλὰς τῶν καρδιῶν , perhaps an echo of the tradition behind Lk. 12:2f., even if the Pauline Sitz im Leben is different<sup>284</sup>. Lk. 2:35 δ' ὥς ἂν ἀποκαλυφθῶσιν ἐκ πολλῶν καρδιῶν δικοιμιστοί. (X adds πονηροί), appears to mean that the child will be the cause of exposing the secret attitudes and thoughts of those whom he will later confront; in particular exposing their attitude to himself. The thought of judgment or testing is not necessarily implied by the verb<sup>285</sup>.

(b) Eschatological exposure

Lk. 17:30, ἡ ἡμέρα ὃ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀποκαλύπτει (D - λυφθῇ )<sup>286</sup>. The day of the Son of Man finds an antecedent in the conduct of Sodom. In that future day the Son of Man will be openly disclosed to the pleasure seeking crowds. This revelation is illustrated in 17:24. It is compared with lightning which itself conveys the thoughts of suddenness and universal visibility. It must be noted, against Sirard, that though this term is set in a context which relates the judgment to befall the wicked, the word itself does not acquire a juridical meaning. We cannot translate, 'in the day he is revealed for judgment' even though this is the result of his manifestation (cf. 17:29 καὶ ἀπώλεσεν πάντας v.l. ἀπάντας : a reference to Sodom). The evangelist is mainly, if not entirely, dealing with the conditions prevailing before 'the Revelation'. I Pet. 1:7 contains a similar thought. The author hopes that Christian faith will be found unto praise, glory and honour ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ , i.e. at his public

appearing. Bigg is interpreting when he states the noun means, "the revelation of Christ in His majesty as Judge and Rewarder"<sup>287</sup>. By the time this letter was written there was no doubt a closer association in mind between this revelation and judgment for reward or punishment. The context implies emphasis on the disclosure and not so much the purpose.

1:8 says that they have not yet seen Christ, but in a little while, v.6, they will apprehend him visibly<sup>288</sup>, cf. 1:13 where the same expression is used: a technical phrase? In 4:13 we have the genitive τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ added to the noun, and it refers once more to Christ. For this feature see I Cor. 1:7, τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ and II.1:7, ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ.

Paul, in I Cor. 3:13, says that each man's work φανερόν γενήσεται, for ( γάρ ) the day will make it clear ( δηλώσει ) because it (the day) is revealed in fire which will test the work of each. The thought is very similar to Lk.17:30. The Day of Christ will expose the worth of what each has done with fire. The fire might be the means by which a test is made<sup>289</sup>, or alternatively the Day is to 'to be lit up with fire'<sup>290</sup>. There is no thought of judgment in the word itself, and we could not translate 'taken in judgment'.

The next group of texts, Rom. 8:18,19; I Pet. 1:5; 5:1 refer basically to one idea; at the End-time the Christian can expect glory and salvation to be made visible and real. Rom. 2:5 is the only other passage of interest: ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ Θεοῦ.

The genitive defines the nature of the revelation; it is an open display of the just character of God. This is what makes it a day of wrath. It will bring the afflictions of God upon the unrighteous. We must point out that even if the word is defined by the genitive in terms of judgment, it only refers to the 'revelation' (disclosure) of the attribute, not the judgment itself. If any word acquires the latter thought, it is ἡμέρα, 'The Judgment Day', cf. Lk. 17:30 and the use of ἡμέρα there.

We are now in a position to draw certain conclusions.

i. If the verb and noun are found in contexts relating to rewards and punishments we must not presume to translate the words by 'revelation for judgment or reward'. It is probably true that the belief in the coming of Christ did lead to certain close associations, but we must beware of importing such without good evidence.

ii. The passages discussed have laid emphasis on one basic idea; what has been hidden will be exposed to view<sup>291</sup>. In eschatological references this is particularly true. It is more than coincidence that ἀποκαλύπτω ( -ψις ) are associated with phrases and terms suggesting light; lightning, Lk. 17:30; fire, I Cor. 3:3; glory, I Pet. 1:5,7; 4:13; 5:1; Rom. 8:18,19<sup>292</sup>. II.1:7f. associates the revelation of the Lord Jesus with 'fire'<sup>293</sup>, cf. Is. 66:15; Mal. 4:1; Heb. 10:25 and stresses that the appearance will be from heaven, cf. Phil. 3:20<sup>294</sup>, I.1:10, thus heightening the idea of a public entry by Christ at the End-time. This pattern of thought matches that of Acts 1:10f., where the

Shekinah glory swallows up the Risen Christ, and his disciples are told that he will come in the same way as he went. It is no doubt due to this tradition that 'glory' and 'fire' are often associated with 'The Revelation' in the minds of N.T. authors. In other words the emphasis lies not on the judgment but the open disclosure of Christ<sup>295</sup>.

iii. There is no need for a Middle meaning<sup>296</sup> to be found for the Passive form in our passage or elsewhere. The thought of the Apostle requires the Anomos to be revealed by someone else.

iv. We cannot think of a particular time as the moment of the revelation of the Anomos. It could be the 'sitting and proclamation in the temple', 2:4 or performing the deceitful miracles, 2:9f. In view of the parallel with ἐλθῆναι, 2:3 (which is another reason to reject Sirard's view) the moment is left undefined.

v. The verb ἀποκαλύπτω is entirely appropriate to express the aspect of disclosure with regard to the Parousia. It is interesting that this word and its noun are used far more often to denote the Parousia event, than the Greek word παρουσία. We have suggested a reason for the decline of the latter. The former has strong roots in the LXX and the thought world of the O.T. It is easy to see how the terms could pass from the idea of openly communicating divine truth and Yahweh's Character (Is. 52:10<sup>297</sup>) to a more concrete nuance, namely, the exposure of a person at the End-time, and perhaps the character of that person<sup>298</sup>. If Paul found the word useful (from tradition?) we can suppose it became more

and more dominant in his mind, along with other Jewish expressions associated with 'Day of the Lord.' The writer of I Peter uses it as a key word for designating the coming of Christ.

vi. It has been applied to the Anomos as another 'mocking' counterpart to Christ's coming (cf. μυστήριον, ἐνέργεια, παρουσία: words applied to God or Christ elsewhere).

We have fixed the meaning of the verb as 'public disclosure' but we have to enquire about the origin of the idea of a visible return. There are two texts which in our opinion have had a powerful effect on this development within Christian eschatology. The texts are Zech. 12:10 (and the following verses, 11-14)<sup>299</sup> and Dan. 7:13. We shall deal with Zech. 12:10 first. There are three basic sentiments in it.

(a) 'They shall look unto me', וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח עַמִּי.

('me': followed by LXX, Theod., Aquila, Sym. Tg.; 45 Heb. MSS. have 'unto him', which is followed in the N.T. The text of LXX is, ἐκβλέψονταί πρὸς με.

(b) 'whom they pierced', וְלֹא יִשְׁכַּח עַמִּי.

The LXX has ἀνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο. Either the translators read קָרָן for קָרָן inadvertently, or else they were attempting to modify the daring anthropomorphism with a verb meaning literally, 'dance in triumph over', hence 'treat despitefully'<sup>300</sup>. Theod. and Jn. 19:37 have εἰς ὃ ἐξεκέντησαν<sup>301</sup>.

(c) 'and they shall mourn for him',  $\text{וְיִתְּנוּ לָהּ דִּבְרֵי$ .  
 LXX, καὶ κóψονται ( ὀψονται,  $\lambda^*$  ) ἐπ' αὐτὸν  
 ( αὐτοῦς, A; αὐτοῖς,  $\Phi$  ).

At some stage in the life of the church this verse from Zechariah acquired Messianic significance. It is applied by the fourth evangelist as a proof text of the death of Jesus;  $\text{ὀψονται}^{302}$  εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν 19:37. In Revelation the text is transferred to the Parousia, 1:7<sup>303</sup>. In this latter text all three sentiments from Zechariah are found, and strengthened by other phrases<sup>304</sup>: καὶ ὀψεται αὐτὸν πᾶς ὀφθαλμὸς καὶ οἵτινες αὐτὸν ἐξεκέντησαν, καὶ κóψονται ἐπ' αὐτὸν πᾶσι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς. The mention of 'tribes' is an allusion to Zech. 12:14, πᾶσι αἱ φυλαὶ αἱ ὑπολειπόμεναι<sup>305</sup>. We have not finished looking at the influence of this text, but the thought of a visible appearance of Christ and a manifestation to the world are clearly expressed in Revelation on the basis of the Zechariah text. It is a thought which the meaning of ἀποκαλύπτω ( -ψις ) conveys. In our opinion the early church derived in part its belief from this text<sup>306</sup> and I.1:10; 4:16 and Phil. 3:2, possibly II.1:10, reflect this expectation.

Linked with the Zechariah text in Rev. 1:7 is the other important text of Dan. 7:13. Here the significant phrase for us is 'coming with the clouds',<sup>307</sup>. In the Danielic passage the Son of Man is brought near to the Ancient of Days in order to receive publicly a kingdom, authority and honour; καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ (Theod.  $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$ , ) τῶν νεφελῶν



τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἦρχετο (Theod.

ἐρχόμενος ). It may be that the clouds in Daniel

represent a chariot by which the figure arrives. This cer-

tainly appears to be the case in Rev. 1:7, 'Ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται

μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν . It also serves to emphasize the

public manifestation of Christ cf. Rev. 14:14. Whether the

clouds are taken literally or regarded as a reference to the

Shekinah (cf. Acts 1:11) matters little to the argument.

Our concern lies with the following points:

- i. The link of Dan. 7:13 and Zech. 12:10 in eschatological thought.
- ii. The fact that both texts emphasize the public disclosure of the Risen Christ.

If II.1:10 contains an echo of Zech. 12:10, it is quite probable that a relationship exists between Dan. 7:13 and II.1:7, ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ μετ' ἀγγέλων συνάρεως αὐτοῦ<sup>308</sup>. The 'revelation ... from heaven' could be equivalent to 'coming with the clouds', Dan. 7:13. II.1:7 has a close association with the thought of Mt. 24:30, and the latter passage has a clear allusion to Dan. 7:13. There cannot be any doubt at all that 'angels of his power', II.1:7 (cf. Mt. 24:30,31 ἐρχόμενον ... μετὰ συνάρεως<sup>309</sup> and ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ ) is a reflection of Zech. 14:5, πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι μετ' αὐτοῦ (M.T. 'you').

The latter text probably influenced I.3:13, μετὰ πάντων ἁγίων αὐτοῦ and possibly II.1:10 ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, especially if ἐν = 'with' not 'among'. It has also affected I En. 1:9, ἔρχεται σὺν ταῖς μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ. This is quoted in Jude 14 with ἐν for σὺν. It must mean 'with' (cf. II.1:10). 'Holy ones' in I En. 12:2; 14:23; 39:5, etc. refer to angels, cf. Dan. 7:10; 8:13. This strengthens the identification of II.1:7 (angels) and Zech. 14:5 (holy ones).

It will clarify the situation if we summarize our findings so far. Zech. 12:10 is quoted in Rev. 1:7; Jn. 19:37. In Rev. it refers to the Parousia event. The idea of a visible coming has probably inspired the writing of I.1:10; 4:16; II.1:10; Phil. 3:20. Dan. 7:13 is quoted in Rev. 1:7; Mt. 24:30 and probably underlies II.1:7, which makes use of Zech. 14:5. Obviously apocalyptic texts from Zechariah were known by the early church.

We shall now look in more detail at Mt. 24:30. This is a text which contains many apocalyptic ideas<sup>310</sup> and, for our immediate interest combines Zech. 12:10 and Dan. 7:13 (cf. Rev. 1:7). The text reads, καὶ τότε κόψονται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ὀψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενου ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν<sup>311</sup>. The underlined words have been added in, no doubt, by the evangelist to the Markan account to locate the thought of v.30 in Zechariah. We have a combination in Mt. of Zech. 12:10 κόψονται and ὀψονται and 12:14 πᾶσαι ... γῆς. In the other two Synoptic Gospels ὀψονται stands by itself.

Whilst we cannot be certain that Mark is using Zechariah it is probable that the word is an echo of Zech. 12:10. The writer knew of Zech. 14:5 cf. Mk. 13:27<sup>312</sup>. The quotation of Daniel in Mt. 24 not only serves to delineate the person who is coming, the Son of Man, but to suggest that the clouds are the vehicle by which he comes. The whole text, whatever its original Sitz im Leben, is now a clear and marked reference to the public uncovering of Christ. With its surrounding verses, 29 and 31, this section of the Apocalypse is a highly dramatic apocalyptic piece of the dénouement of Messiah.

This combination of O.T. texts is no mere coincidence, for it occurs again in Mt. 26:64 = Mk. 14:62 ἀπ' ἄρτι (Mk. omits) ὁψεσθε τ. υἱὸν τ. ἀνθρώπου καθήμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ (Mk. μετὰ) τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. A clear reference again to public disclosure such as is found in ἀποκαλύπτω (-ψις). We note the use of ὁψεσθε and Dan. 7:13. We may also have the combination in Mt. 16:28 where certain people will not taste death until ἴδωσιν τ. υἱὸν τ. ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ <sup>313</sup>.

It is not our purpose to trace the history of these two texts in the early church. Clearly the Daniel text has made a greater impression on eschatology than the Zechariah text; see Mt. 13:26; 24:30; 26:64 (and parallels); Rev. 1:7, 13; 14:14 for quotations. If we include 7:14 and 'The Son of Man' references the list becomes very long. The combination of the two has not escaped the notice of later early church writers.

Did. 16:8 τότε ὄψεται ὁ κόσμος τὸν κύριον ἐρχόμενον ἐπάνω τ. νεφελῶν τ. οὐρανοῦ. Obviously this is an allusion to Mt. 24:30 but with one significant alteration, κόσμος seems to be an abbreviation for 'all the tribes of the earth'. The thought of men seeing the descending eschatological Son of Man is found in other writings, Ep. Barn. 7:9, ἐπειδὴ ὄψονται αὐτὸν τότε τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τὸν ποδὴρῃ ἔχοντα τὸν κόκκινον περὶ τὴν σάρκα καὶ ἐροῦσιν. Οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν, ὃν πότε ἡρεῖς ἐσταυρώσακρεν ἐξουθενήσαντες καὶ κατακεντήσαντες καὶ ἐρπύσαντες;<sup>314</sup> It occurs frequently in Justin Martyr.

Apol. I:52,11, κόψονται φυλὴ πρὸς φυλὴν, καὶ τότε ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν καὶ ἐροῦσιν. Τί, κύριε ἐπλάνησας ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ σου; Ἡ δόξα ἣν εὐλόγησαν οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐγενήθη ἡμῖν εἰς ὄνειδος.

Dial. 14:8, (a clear link of Dan. 7:13; Zech. 12:10), ὅτε ἐν δόξῃ καὶ ἐπάνω τῶν νεφελῶν παρέσται καὶ ὄψεται ὁ λαὸς ὁρῶν καὶ γνωρισεῖ εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν.

32:2, ῥίαν μὲν ἐν ἣ ἐξεκέντηθη ὑφ' ὁρῶν, δευτέρῃ δὲ ὅτε ἐπιγνώσεσθε εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησατε καὶ κόψονται αἱ φυλαὶ ὁρῶν.

64:7, The Lord will come again

κοπτεσθαι οἱ ἐκκεντήσαντες αὐτόν.

118:1, ἐν ἣ κόπτεσθαι μέλλουσι πάντες οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν φυλῶν ὁρῶν ἐκκεντήσαντες τοῦτον τὸν χριστόν.  
cf. 126.

We have attempted to find a reason for the eschatological use of ἀποκαλύπτω ( -ψις ) to denote the visible appearance of Christ. Of course other eschatological elements in the O.T. and later thought contribute to the idea but the two texts we have studied certainly provide part of the explanation for the belief. Two things have emerged; firstly, they were known in the apocalyptic milieu and secondly, they were adapted to Christian thinking as proof texts of future expectation. It is likely that these texts were adapted at an early stage since we have shown earlier that the Parousia idea is pre-Pauline. This means that before A.D. 50 the texts will have helped to shape the manner of that future hope. The texts then continued to be used at a later stage in the life of the church.

We can summarise briefly the discussion in this section in the following two points.

1. The words ἀποκαλύπτω ( -ψις ) emphasize disclosure, exposing what is concealed. In connection with Christ's coming, the event is associated with descriptions, such as fire and light, which heighten the expectation of public disclosure. The Anomos has a similar coming, which is a mocking counterpart, a public disclosure of The Person filled and controlled by Satan.
2. Zech. 12:10 and Dan. 7:13 have moulded the manner of Christ's Parousia and therefore, indirectly, that of the Anomos. Within our pericope there are indications of the manner and purpose of the revelation of the Anomos which support these conclusions.

(a) The Anomos 'sits in the Temple' when he proclaims himself as God 2:4. This is part of the coming of the Anomos; this is how his presence is known. By way of contrast Christ sits at the right hand of power when he comes into public view, Mt. 26:64; (cf. 19:28; 25:31, the Son of Man will sit on the throne of glory). The Risen Christ is said to be at present sitting at the right hand of power, Heb. 1:3,13; 8:1; 10:12; 12:2; Mk. 16:19; Acts 2:34; Rom. 8:34; I Cor. 15:25; Eph. 1:20; Col. 3:1. As Paul shared this belief he would probably see the action of the Antichrist as a complete denial of this truth.

(b) The Anomos comes for those who are already perishing, have rejected the truth, do not believe, and take pleasure in unrighteousness, 2:9-12. In contrast, Christ comes for the wonder, glory and salvation of his people, I.1:10; 4:16f.; II.1:10ff., and to gather them together for ever, I.4:18; II.2:1.

From a study of II.2:3ff. it is impossible to deduce when Paul considered the actual revelation would take place; whether by the proclamation of deity, 2:4, or the working of signs and wonders, 2:9 or both. Nor can we presuppose that Paul knew of the whereabouts or pre-existence of the Antichrist<sup>315</sup>. The word 'revelation' does not focus attention upon these questions, but upon the manner of the event itself. No doubt Paul believed that when the event occurred, Christians would be aware that it had and of the evil activity of the Anomos.



## B. The Activity of the Anomos

The work of the Anomos can be considered in two ways: firstly in relation to himself and anything divine, and secondly in relation to others who will become his followers. There is a very real connection between both aspects but for our purposes and the analysis of the passage, we can separate the two. We must remember that the word *ἀνομία* is the link between the two. The future figure is the Man of lawlessness and it is the intention of the Anomos to practice and encourage it wherever possible.

### 1. Lawlessness in Relation to the Anomos

*Ἀνομία* is not only rebellion but lawlessness in the widest possible sense. This lawlessness shows itself first of all in the way the Anomos figure sets himself up in the place of God. Before Paul moves to consider how he affects others in later verses, vv.9ff. he describes the attempted displacement of God, v.4 ( *ὥστε* does not indicate that the man is successful)<sup>316</sup>. The first part of the statement of v.4 is a comment upon the nature or character of the activity of lawlessness. It is a theological way of stating his work. The second part of the statement ('so that he sits ...') describes how he carries out his attempt to displace everything sacred and revered. We shall therefore discuss his activity in this section under two headings.

(a) The Opposition & Self-exaltation of the Anomos

In our study of the historical antecedents of the Antichrist figure we have looked at characters who have displayed a similar type of opposition to God. We shall only consider the background again in so far as it helps to exegete the passage and determine the meaning of some of the words.

The two words ἀντικείμενος and ὑπεραίρόμενος are linked together by a single article<sup>317</sup>, in the same way that παρούσα and ἐπισυνκλήρυξ are connected 2:1. Assuming this to be the case we can either treat them as two substantives or two participles. It is more likely that the words are describing the activity of the figure<sup>318</sup> than being used as descriptive nouns. Either way it makes little difference to the sense of the verse. The former word quite clearly means 'oppose' as is shown by its use in other Pauline passages, I Cor. 16:9; Gal. 5:17; Phil. 1:28; cf. I Tim. 1:10; 5:14<sup>319</sup>. If it is a noun (or possibly a title) it can be translated 'The adversary' or 'The opposer'. The real query lies with the use of ἐπί. Can it be connected with the first verb? If the ἐπί means 'over', as seems quite suitable for ὑπεραίρόμενος, then it becomes inappropriate if attached to 'opposes'. The former verb is regularly followed by the dative, and this is what we might have expected here. Some commentators however think that the verb with the preposition can be taken to mean 'against' (which is equally suitable for ὑπεραίρω) and believe this is the solution to the problem<sup>320</sup>. Both Blass-Debrunner (para. 233) and Moulton-Turner<sup>321</sup> give no

examples of ἐπί + accusative meaning 'against', so we must doubt this explanation. We can either assume that the thought expressed by ἐπὶ πάντα λέγ. belongs in Paul's thought to ἀντικείμενος, or else assume an ellipse with τῷ θεῷ or τῷ Χριστῷ being understood. The latter explanation is probably preferable in that the following verb, ὑπερβαίνων, conveys the sense of 'exalts himself over' rather than 'against'.<sup>322</sup> Indirectly, of course, opposition is implied.

The word ὑπερβαίνω occurs less frequently than the first. In the N.T. (apart from here) it occurs twice in II Cor. 12:7 and in the LXX six times<sup>323</sup>. Only in II.2:4 do we find it with ἐπί. The thought behind this word seems to be that the Anomos places himself above, or exalts himself above everything else. It is not emphasizing so much the antagonism or opposition to other things, but the assumption that the Anomos is greater than all else. It is quite likely too that the thought of pride is present in the word<sup>324</sup>.

The precise area against and over which the Anomos opposes and exalts himself is given by the words ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον θεὸν ἢ σέβαστα. It is likely that the πάντα governs both subsequent nouns and that even the λεγόμενον performs the same function. Paul makes it absolutely clear that this figure will know no limits to his claims. He exalts himself above all gods and idols. Strictly speaking Griffiths<sup>325</sup> is right in pointing out that πάντα is masculine, applies to θεὸν only and should be translated 'everyone called god'. We should expect

therefore that  $\kappa\alpha\lambda$  would occur before  $\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\beta\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha$  if the thought of 'all' is continued. It is quite probable that Paul expected 'all' to be repeated with the second noun and indeed it is very difficult not to use it: the statement implies exaltation over not just a single  $\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\beta\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha$  but all. This applies as well to the adjectival participle, 'termed' which can be read quite naturally with the noun.

Whilst grammatical points are important they do not affect the total sense of the verse. This is true of  $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$ , which has been taken in the sense of 'so-called' thus throwing doubt on the reality of 'gods'.<sup>326</sup> However we cannot deduce this from the word and we must translate 'termed god' irrespective of the reality of deity<sup>327</sup>. The fact that the word is added acts as a safeguard against any implied polytheism whilst at the sametime showing the all-inclusive opposition and exaltation of the Man of lawlessness. If the word is applied to  $\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\beta\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha$  it serves the same function: 'everything termed an object of worship', (cf. for the noun, Acts 17:23; Wis. 14:20; 15:17; Bel. 27 (Theod)). Paul has added it to Dan. 11:36 (which is the text behind his statement) to include anything religious<sup>328</sup>. It might also be a reflection of Dan. 11:37, 'he will magnify himself above all ( $\epsilon\pi\grave{\iota} \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma \mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\lambda\upsilon\nu\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ , Theod.)'. Paul is specifying the Danielic 'all' in terms of sacred objects of worship.

### Conclusion

The meaning of this statement is very clear. The Man of lawlessness will have no respect for anyone or thing called God or revered. His one aim is to oppose and set himself up in place of and above all that has been previously held sacred. Paul has described the real character of his anomia: opposition and self-exaltation. The next part of the verse goes on to outline how he attempts to achieve this.

#### (b) Sitting in the Temple & Proclaiming Deity

ὅτε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καθίσκει, ἀποδεικνύοντα ἑαυτὸν ὅτι ἐστὶν θεός.

If we take the first part of this text by itself we could provide several possible solutions for its meaning. It could be a reference to a) The Jerusalem Temple b) The Church c) some Future Heavenly Temple or d) be understood figuratively. We have already seen that in Is. 14:13ff. and Ezek. 28:2 the 'sitting in the temple' must be taken figuratively<sup>329</sup>. On the other hand Mk. 13:14 might give the impression that we should seek some literal interpretation. The 'Abomination' is described as 'standing' or 'set up ( ἑστηκότα ) where he ought not'. Although the thought of the Danielic 'Abomination of Desolation' lies behind the Synoptic Apocalypse and II we cannot be sure that Paul knew of the tradition which personalised the reference and the reference is to 'standing' (if we translate it that way) not sitting. If Paul borrowed from a tradition similar to that in Mk. 13 we might have expected the same word. The fact that we have καθίσκει suggests that we are on safer ground in considering the passages in Isaiah and



Ezekiel as the background to Paul's thought but we shall return to this in a moment.

To sit in the temple, or 'inner shrine' ( *ναός* ) of God, means to 'sit in the place (instead) of God'. This can be done literally or figuratively. The only possible place that Paul could conceive of the Anomos doing this literally is in the Jerusalem Temple<sup>330</sup>, but did Paul regard Jerusalem as the place where God dwelt in a special way?<sup>331</sup> Surely Paul considered the church to be the place where God was, through the Spirit<sup>332</sup>. The Old Covenant and its cult had ceased. There was now a New Covenant<sup>333</sup>. In which case does the *ναός* refer to the Church?<sup>334</sup> The only clear reference to the Church as the new Temple is Eph. 2:21 cf. I Cor. 3:16f.; II Cor. 6:16. The other reference, I Cor. 6:19, almost certainly refers to individual Christians as a temple of the Holy Spirit<sup>335</sup>. If the Ephesians text is quoted as proof we ought to note that the Temple is 'made' by the growth of the community<sup>336</sup>. It is something living and intangible which makes it difficult to imagine the Anomos sitting in it. Moreover does a solution which limits the *ναός* to a particular group or religion suit the passage? Paul appears to be saying that he, the Antichrist figure, sets himself above every god and object of worship. The thought is of world-wide opposition, cf. Did. 16:4, *κοσμοπλᾶνῃ*. If we relate it to some future Heavenly Temple as described in certain Jewish texts, I En. 14:16-18, 20; cf. 26:1, 2; T. Lev. 5:1, 2; II Bar. 4:2-6; 4 Ezra 9:26; 10:57; 4 QSl. 40:2-18 (modelled on Ezek. 40-48)<sup>337</sup> we immediately transfer the opposition and exaltation away from the earth. As Best



rightly points out, II.2:3f. assumes something of which men are aware if it is to be one of the signs of the Parousia<sup>338</sup>.

It is much more likely that Paul is using figurative ideas when he talks about sitting in the temple. For one thing he can recall that although Is. 14 and Ezek. 28 refer to historical persons, it is improbable that a literal sitting in a or the Temple is envisaged in either text. In fact Ezek. 28:2 implies that the sitting refers to what is said by the prince of Tyre; 'You have said, I am god, I sit in the seat of God': in other words 'I assume God's place and divine honours'. Likewise Is. 14:13f., where the king of Babylon says in his heart, 'I will ascend ... exalt my throne above ... sit upon the mount'. He is not pictured as literally doing these things. The conclusion of his inward aspirations comes at the end of v.14, 'I will be like the Most High' ('I will assume his place and honours'). We have a similar connection in II.2:4. The ἀποδεικνύντα ἑαυτὸν ὅτι ἐστὶν θεός is not 'an expression of what sitting in the Temple implies'<sup>339</sup>, but the actual way in which he 'sits'. He does not proclaim himself god by the sitting, but by actually stating he is θεός<sup>340</sup> he shows he assumes the role of God, and takes his place and his honour, (cf. Rev. 13:6, the Beast blasphemes God's tabernacle, i.e. pours scorn on what belongs to God; he does not enter it.)

The Anomos figure is a counterpart to the Divine. In sitting therefore he is attempting what is said of God and Christ<sup>341</sup>. In the O.T. we have many references to God sitting on a throne (I Kings 22:19; Is. 6:1; Dan. 7:9; cf. Rev. 4:2), sitting as a king for ever (Ps. 29:10), in the heavens

(Ps. 2:4; cf. Is. 40:22). God's throne is in His Temple (Ps. 11:4; cf. 18:6; Mic. 1:2; Hab. 2:20), or in the heavens (Ps. 103:19; Is. 66:1; cf. Mt. 5:34). In the N.T. Christ is given a role of sitting in majesty and honour (Mk. 16:19; Rom. 8:34; Eph. 1:20; Col. 3:1; Heb. 1:3; 8:1; 10:12; 12:2; I Pet. 3:22; Rev. 3:21; cf. Acts 2:33; Mt. 19:28)<sup>342</sup>.

It is against this background that we must understand the future assertion of divine honours. The Antichrist will aspire to take the place of Christ by proclaiming that he is above everyone and everything human and divine, that he is in truth 'god'. This figure will herald the End and is an eschatological sign for the Christian community. The church must have been tempted to see a few years later Nero as Antichrist; certainly the Church Fathers believed the Emperor to be a prototype of the coming Anomos<sup>343</sup>.

## 2. Lawlessness in Relation to Others

The activity of the Anomos in relation to others is described in II.2:9ff. Before we consider it we must decide which complement is to be attached to οὗ ἐστίν<sup>344</sup> ἡ παρουσία. It is possible to link the statement with three expressions.

(a) We can attach it to τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις, 2:10. As the complement is rather far away from the subject this is improbable<sup>345</sup>.

(b) — connect it to κατ' ἐνέργειαν ... but this seems to be an explanatory note on the parousia of the Anomos, rather than a complement<sup>346</sup>.

(c) We prefer, therefore, to link the subject with ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει ... ἀπάτῃ ἀδικίας, 2:9,10<sup>347</sup>. This means that τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις is dependent on this complement and, as we have already suggested, the κατ' ἐν. τοῦ Σατανᾶ is explanatory. This seems to read more naturally: 'Whose parousia is, according to Satan's energy, with all power ... to those who are perishing'. Taking it this way gives slightly more emphasis to the activity of the Anomos in relation to others, whereas the second alternative gives added stress to the role of Satan. Ultimately there is not a great deal of difference between any of the three possibilities: the thought of the passage is very clear.

We are now in a position to comment upon the activity of the Anomos. This can be done in two ways<sup>348</sup>.

(a) The Means by which he Deceives

Ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει καὶ σημεῖοις καὶ τέρασιν  
ψεύδους καὶ ἐν πάσῃ ἀπάτῃ ἀδικίας. We shall look further at this statement under three headings.

(i) Power ( δύναμις ).

The singular is used rather than the plural which often means miracles, e.g. Mt. 7:22; II Cor. 12:12; Gal. 3:5. The former emphasizes the force or energy to do something. Satan provides the real power to achieve the ends of the

Anomos, although ultimately it is God who makes effective what is done. So in 2:11 we have ἐνέργειαν πλάνης. This means 'a possessing error'<sup>349</sup>; that is, those who are doomed have to listen to the delusion of the Anomos because they are captivated by what is said and done. An example is found in III Kgdms. 22:9ff. Through the lying spirit sent by God (v.22) Ahab is deceived (cf. v.20, ἠπατάω). The δύναμις represents then the force which is needed to deceive whether by supernatural or other means (see Rom. 1:4,16; I Cor. 2:4 + πνεῦμα, 5; 15:24; II Cor. 13:4 (bis); Phil. 3:10; I.1:5 - all of which stress the power which makes something effective).

To reinforce δύναμις the word παῖς<sup>350</sup> is added. All available power is put in the activity of the Anomos<sup>351</sup>. Presumably to Paul this figure is the last challenge to God's complete rule and authority and therefore all of Satan's power to deceive is made available to and through the Man of lawlessness. We should note once more how a word (δύναμις), so frequently connected with God (I Cor. 1:8) or Christ (II Cor. 12:9) or the Spirit (Rom. 15:19 v.1 + Θεοῦ p<sup>46</sup> ἁ K L pm; + ἁγίου A D G al lat; + Θεοῦ ἁγίου (a harmonisation) 330 451), is applied to the Anomos. He is the very counterpart of all things divine.

(ii) Lying Signs & Wonders(σημείοις καὶ τέρασιν ψεύδους).  
(without ψεύδους)

This is a word combination found quite often in the N.T. Jn. 4:48; Acts 2:22,43; 4:30; 5:12 et al.; Rom. 15:19; II Cor. 12:12<sup>352</sup>. It is a standard Christian expression to denote the supernatural works of God or the Spirit. By Satan's power the Anomos will perform supernatural works in the same way as Christians can through the Spirit. These works will make his parousia and claims attractive and compelling. It will be the authentication of who he says he is, 2:4. The ψεύδους, which almost certainly must apply to both words but not to δύνανται<sup>353</sup>, makes a comment on the 'signs and wonders'. Does it suggest they are false in themselves?<sup>354</sup> This is unlikely. Paul is here commenting on the real character of the works. Although they will actually happen they will lie as to their real purpose. They are intended to deceive<sup>355</sup>.

The signs and wonders are left undefined. However in view of the counterpart to Christian signs and wonders we can suppose that the Apostle intended healing miracles, Acts 3:7; 4:30; miracles of judgment, Acts 5:5(?); 13:11; amazing feats, Acts 7:36; cf. Ex. 7:3; 14:21; also Acts 8:9, and possibly prophecies, Acts 11:28. No doubt Paul left it deliberately vague. The Anomos will publicly use his supernatural works to achieve his aims.

(iii) In all Deceit of Unrighteousness

( καὶ ἐν πάσῃ ἀπάτῃ ἀδικίας ).

The καὶ is not to be taken as 'even' or regarded as redundant. This last statement about the activity of the Anomos brings a new thought. He has the 'power', he can perform 'signs and wonders' but his chief means and end is to encourage ἀδικία. He will find already that there are those (whom we have identified as apostates) who take pleasure in it, 2:12. His work will be to continue that affection for evil. Paul is careful to phrase what he has to say: 'In all (notice the inclusiveness again, cf. 2:9) deceit leading to unrighteousness',<sup>356</sup>. This is to be preferred to 'originating from',<sup>357</sup>. The word ἀδικία is also an inclusive word, which is why it is preferred to lawlessness. So with every deceitful means the Anomos leads his followers into sin.

(b) The Circle which he Affects

We have four descriptions of the people who will be affected by his activity.

2:10, τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις.

τὴν ἀγάπην τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἔδέξαντο.

2:12, οἱ μὴ πιστεύσαντες τῇ ἀληθείᾳ.

εὐδοκήσαντες τῇ ἀδικίᾳ.



In the first Paul stresses the condition of the apostates<sup>358</sup>. They are (prophetic present) on the road leading to destruction. The dative probably conveys 'among' and 'for'. Both ideas are implied by the text, cf. I Cor. 1:18; II Cor. 2:15; 4:3. The other three statements reflect the following thoughts:

i. This group has had ample opportunity to respond to the truth. They have not been 'doomed' because they belong to one group by God's predestination (cn. IQS 3:17ff.).

ii. They have rejected<sup>359</sup> the love of the truth i.e. commitment to it<sup>360</sup>. They have not believed in it<sup>361</sup>. The εἰς τὸ σωθῆναι αὐτοὺς, 2:10, is a way of intensifying the rejection<sup>362</sup>. The salvation they could have experienced has not been accepted<sup>363</sup>, so they are perishing.

iii. Their rejection is positive in that they take pleasure in unrighteousness<sup>364</sup>.

It is in consequence of the last three statements that we can regard these people as apostates and God judges them in the way He does. They have brought their own doom upon themselves. Part of that doom is the arrival of the Anomos and his specific activity to encourage them to sin and worship him. So in this section Paul has once more, cf. 2:5, re-iterated some of his eschatological detail about the Anomos and his work in order that the Thessalonian community will appreciate why the Day of the Lord has not come.

### C. THE END OF THE ANOMOS

The end of the Anomos is briefly described in 2:8.

Ὁν ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἀνελεῖ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ  
στομάτου αὐτοῦ καὶ καταργήσῃ τὴν ἐπιφανεῖα τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ.

It is described from two aspects; the means and the result.

The means are described in two ways: (a) the Breath of his mouth and (b) the manifestation of his parousia. To be strictly accurate we should attach the verbs ἀνελεῖ and καταργήσῃ to these phrases, but the former indicate what happens to the Anomos, so we shall consider them under the heading of, the result. The first clause is reminiscent of Holy War imagery, which is quite likely in view of its O.T. background and the presence of the most important element in such imagery, the complete destruction of evil and anti-God forces<sup>365</sup>.

#### I. The Means

##### (a) The Breath of his Mouth

Together with ἀνελεῖ<sup>366</sup> there is an obvious allusion to, but not a quotation of, Is. 11:4,

MT. שׁוֹטֵן יִהְיֶה בְּיָדוֹ וְיִכָּרֵם בְּפִי וְיִשְׁבֹּץ בְּרִגְלֵי

LXX. καὶ πατάξει γῆν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ στομάτου αὐτοῦ,

καὶ ἐν πνεύματι διὰ χειλέων ἀνελεῖ ἀσεβῆ (ἀ: τῷ πνεύματι).

Paul has interpreted Is. 11:1ff. messianically. The shoot and branch are the Lord Jesus. This is very much in line with other writers since Is. 11:1 is found in Mt. 2:23; Acts 13:23; Heb. 7:14; Rev. 5:5; 22:16. Is. 11:2 in Eph. 1:17; I Pet. 4:14; Is. 11:3 in Jn. 7:24. Is. 11:4 in Jn. 7:24; Eph. 6:17;

Rev. 19:11 and Is. 11:5 in Eph. 6:14. In view of the widespread messianic interpretation of this O.T. passage, it is no surprise that Paul has also seen it in this way. If Christ is the subject, what about 'the wicked' (collective singular)? Has Paul taken it as a real singular? In view of Paul's choice of ἀνομία it is likely that he has chosen to ignore the Isaiah word altogether. Paul has freely adapted this text anyway cf. I En. 62:2; Ps.Sol. 17:24, in that instead of using λόγος he has chosen πνεῦμα to go with στόμα as the underlined words show. His adaptation makes, in fact, little difference to the meaning. Ἀνελεῖ is very close in thought to κατάξει, Zech. 13:7 = slay. Λόγος is a more 'concrete' understanding of πνεῦμα. Στόμα is virtually identical to χεῖλος. There is no need to see an unconscious or conscious allusion to Ps. 32 (33):6.

Breath can be taken figuratively and regarded as something very strong and powerful. Texts such as Ex. 15:18; Job. 4:9; Rev. 2:16; 19:15; cf. IQSb. 5:24 indicate that this is so. The Breath of God is no mere wind, but a force that sweeps all before it. On the other hand it could be that Paul is referring to the Holy Spirit, as Griblin suggests<sup>367</sup>, but this is unlikely because it introduces a new person into the arena of warfare and denies the allusion to Is. 11:4. Breath can be better understood, at least initially, from the parallelism with λόγος in Isaiah, i.e. the very breath

which is used to expel a word is sufficient to topple the Antichrist from his throne. To put it another way; a word is not necessary to remove the Anomos. The Breath of Christ as illustrated in the above texts, will deal him a mortal blow.

(b) The Appearance of his Parousia

This phrase describes the End of the Anomos from another standpoint. It also sets a time for his destruction; the public manifestation of the Lord Jesus. The two words are not to be equated in Paul. We have already determined that  $\kappa\alpha\rho\upsilon\sigma\iota\acute{\alpha}$  cannot be restricted to 'coming' but conveys the sense of 'presence'. This makes excellent sense here; it is the  $\epsilon\pi\iota\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\iota\kappa$  of his presence which brings to an end the figure, since he can not stand in the presence of Christ.

The word  $\epsilon\pi\iota\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\iota\kappa$  (cf.  $\kappa\alpha\rho\upsilon\sigma\iota\acute{\alpha}$ ) has cultic associations and can also be linked to the appearing of kings. Pax defined it in terms of a sudden and swift appearance of divinity before men, under a physical or spiritual form<sup>368</sup>. Lüthmann has challenged this and claims that in II.2:8 and elsewhere in the N.T. it really means 'saving deliverance'<sup>369</sup>. He argues for this on the basis of the word's technical use (in classical times) as a military term used in the sense of 'saving intervention'<sup>370</sup>. This would suit our passage which has holy war imagery, but the thought of a saving deliverance for God's people is not applicable. Quite the opposite. It is the destruction of the Anomos which is to the fore.

We find ἐπιφάνεια in Jewish literature, although mainly in II and III Maccabees where Greek influence is apparent. In II Mac. 3:24; 5:2f.; 11:8; 15:27 it denotes celestial apparitions of one sort or another, or it refers to the manifestation of God, 12:22; 14:15; 15:27. The same thoughts are found in III Mac. 2:9, God glorified the temple with ἐπιφανεῖα μεγκλοπρεπεῖ cf. too 5:8, 51. It is likely that Josephus has been influenced in his use of the term. Ant. ix.60; Elisha's men marvelled at the ἐπιφάνεια and δύναντις of the God of the Israelites, cf. xii.136; B.J. vi.298, a sign in the sky<sup>371</sup>.

When we contrast this with the only other references in the LXX (i.e. apart from II and III Maccabees) we are impressed with the different use to which the word is put.

II Kgdms. 7:23, τοῦ ποιῆσαι (Israel) μεγαλωσύνην καὶ ἐπιφανεῖαν.

Esth. 5:1, The king had πᾶσαν στολὴν τῆς ἐπιφανείας αὐτοῦ ἐνδεδύκεν.

Amos 5:22, καὶ σωτηρίους ἐπιφανείας ὑμῶν οὐκ ἐπιβλέψονται.

By the first century B.C. the word in the Jewish literature cited is reserved for the appearance of God or some celestial sign (apparition). There is a clear meaning of 'coming into the light, into view'<sup>372</sup>.

The same thought continues in the N.T., where the word is used six times. In the Pastorals, once it is used of the first coming of Christ, II Tim. 1:10 whilst the rest refer to the 'second', I Tim. 6:14; II Tim. 4:1,8; Tit. 2:13. We cannot doubt that the cultic use of the term has influenced

the way it is used in the Pastorals. The true 'epiphany' or 'appearing of the Σωτήρ' is set forth. This is parallel to παρουσία which sets forth the true parousia in Christian terms. The two words are not synonymous<sup>373</sup>, whether in 2:8 or elsewhere. The word ἐπιφάνεια is far closer in meaning to ἀποκάλυψις than παρουσία since it lays emphasis on the coming into view, the appearance of Christ<sup>374</sup>. No doubt too, it suggested to Paul the true epiphany over against false epiphanies of other deities.

The term can not be pleonastic<sup>375</sup> if our translation is correct and parousia is understood as 'coming'. What does 'appearance of his coming' mean? It does not make good sense. If we are correct in taking the latter to mean 'presence', or, at least, have that as its predominating sense, then the translation 'appearance of his presence' ('making his presence visible') is far more satisfactory. It is also a good parallel to 'breath of his mouth'. In other words, the mere appearance of his presence will remove the Anomos<sup>376</sup>.

## II. The Result

### (a) Ἀναίρεω.

This verb is used only here in Paul. It is frequent in Acts (e.g. Acts 2:23) and twice in Lk (22:2; 23:32; elsewhere in Mt. 2:16; II.2:8; Heb. 10:9). If the meaning of the word is slay (kill) then it can be taken quite literally (e.g. Mt. 2:16; Lk. 22:2). It can be used figuratively as in Heb. 10:9, 'He removes the first (Covenant)'. The latter is to be preferred to 'slay'. Paul is not saying that the breath will literally kill the figure. The whole expression



is metaphorical and so the thought of removal, 'be rid of', is in mind.

(b) Καταργέω.

If the first verb predominates in Acts, the second predominates in Pauline writings. It is found six times in Romans, nine times in I Corinthians, four in II Corinthians, three in Galatians: otherwise once in Eph. 2:15; II Tim. 1:10; Heb. 2:14. The use of this verb and the choice of ἐπιφάνεια and παρουσία show Paul has constructed the thought, in contrast to the previous clause which was based on Is. 11:4.

The word does not suggest how the 'appearance' gets rid of the man. It certainly does not mean he is annihilated. It suggests that he is either disposed of, put an end to, and so destroyed (I Cor. 6:13; II Tim. 1:10; Pass, I Cor. 15:26; Heb. 2:14; Rom. 6:6) or rendered ineffective, powerless (Rom. 3:3; Gal. 3:17; I Cor 1:28). The boundaries between the two ideas cannot always be clearly defined. The former is more suitable to our passage. The Lord will put an end to the Anomos and all his activity.

So the Apostle has outlined to the community teaching that he gave earlier on the subject of the Antichrist figure. If only they had remembered they would not now be harbouring an error. This person has not yet come, so the Day of the Lord has not arrived. The Anomos is an individual man with Satanic powers. His one aim is to deceive by his power, through signs and wonders and with the attractiveness of unrighteousness. Although he will have his 'time'

(2:6) he is ultimately not from Satan but God, who has sent him as a punishment to those who have already rejected the truth and committed apostasy. His time lasts so long as God sends and then The Lord will remove and destroy him. The mere appearance of Christ will bring this to pass.

<sup>1</sup>R. Schnackenburg, Die Johannesbriefe (K.Z.N.T., 3rd edn.), Basel, 1965, 1 Jn. 2:7b, 24; 3:11; 4:3; Eph. 4:21; 1 Tim. 4:16.

<sup>2</sup>Too much must not be made of this. Paul may have envisaged political means as a way of procuring religious worship. This has happened in Rev. 13 and 17. The Beasts achieve apostasy and self-deification through non-religious means. Perhaps the author is drawing his own conclusions from II.2:3ff. since there are a great number of parallels between II.2 and Rev. 13 and 17. See R.H. Charles, Hebrew, Jewish and Christian Eschatology, London, 1899, p.383, n.1. 2:9 - 17:8, parousia of Antichrist; 2:9 - 13:2, cf. v.4, instrument of Satan; 2:9 - 13:13, cf. v.15, performs signs etc.; 2:10 - 13:14, deceives faithless; 2:4 - 13:4,5, blasphemes against God; 2:8 - 17:8,11; 19:15, will be destroyed.

<sup>3</sup>See chp. 7, fn.31.

<sup>4</sup>Best, p.288, cf. W. Neil, St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians (Torch Bib. Comm.), London, 1957, pp. 135, 138 who writes of a supernatural figure, involved in cosmic conflict, but cn. (Moffatt), pp. 161ff.

<sup>5</sup>W. Bousset, The Antichrist Legend (transl. by A.H. Keane), London, 1896, pp. 136ff.; Milligan, ad loc.

<sup>6</sup>On ἄνομια, ἄνομος Bauer, s.v. ἄνομια, ἄνομος ; C.H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, London, 1935, pp. 77-80; W. Gutbrod, 'ἄνομια, ἄνομος' in T.D.N.T. IV., pp. 1085ff.; Liddell-Scott, s.v. ἄνομος etc.; Rigaux, p. 655f.; S.J. de Vries, 'Sin' in I.D.B., IV, pp. 361-376.

<sup>7</sup>E.g. Ex. 34:7 A, ἀμαρτίας ; Deut. 9:5 B, ἀσεβείας ; Ps. 31 (32):5 B, ἀμαρτίαν ; Mic. 7:18 A, ἀδικίας.

<sup>8</sup>s.v. 770.

<sup>9</sup>Schnackenburg, op. cit., pp. 185ff.

<sup>10</sup>De Vries, op. cit., p.362, finds this equation especially employed in poetic parallelism. In some cases, he says, synonyms accentuate the peculiar qualities of one another, e.g. Jub. 34:36,37.

<sup>11</sup>Dodd, op. cit., p. 80, concludes that there is a "strong tendency to reduce all manner of evil behaviour to the concepts ἀδικία and ἀνομία, and particularly the latter". Against the last phrase we ought to note that ἀδικία is used for πῖς nearly 80 times and occurs about the same number of times as ἀνομία. The former also tends to occur in a greater number of O.T. books. His statement that ἀνομος (-ία) is not infrequently equated with πῖς is not proven: 5 times for the noun, once with the adjective.

<sup>12</sup>Herodotus, Hist., 1:96,97 Deioes practiced justice (δικαιοσύνην) although there was a great deal of lawlessness (ἀνομίης πολλῆς) in Media. Lawlessness (ἀνομίης) increased greatly. Euripides, Ion, 443, asks, πῶς οὖν δίκαιον τοὺς νόμους ὑμᾶς βροτοῖς γράψαντας αὐτοὺς ἀνομίαν ὀφλισκάνειν, cf. Isocrates, Epp. 6:64.

<sup>13</sup>Sophocles Oed. Col. 142, μή μ', ἵκετεύω, προσίδῃτ' ἀνόμενον, 'O sirs, I am not an outlaw under ban'. Trach. 1096 Heracles bemoans the days of his heroic deeds, when he overcame a half-man, half-horse which was lawless. (ἀνόμενον).

<sup>14</sup>Mt. 7:23; 13:41; 23:28; 24:12; Rom. 4:7; 6:19 (bis); II Cor. 6:14; II.2:3,7; Tit. 2:14; Heb. 1:9; 10:17; 1 Jn. 3:4; cf. παρανομία II Pet. 2:16.

<sup>15</sup>Mk. 15:28 (almost certainly we should omit text with & A B G W D et al.); Lk. 22:37; Acts 2:23; I Cor. 9:21 (quat.); II.2:8; I Tim. 1:9; II Pet. 2:8.

<sup>16</sup>Rom. 2:12 (bis); cf. παρανομέω Acts 23:3.

<sup>17</sup>J. Gnilka 'II Cor. 6:14-7:1 in the light of the Qumran texts and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', in Paul and Qumran (ed. J.M.-O'Connor), London, 1968, pp. 48-68 who tries to bring out the Qumran community contrast between righteousness and evil. Cf. 1QS 1:4f.; 5:1-4; 1QH 1:26f.; 14:15f.; 16:10f.

<sup>18</sup>There is no contrast in Lk. 22:37 and Acts 2:23 because the adjective is used in two 'technical senses', criminals and Gentiles respectively. On the other hand Is. 53:10-12 may feature behind both verses and set them in the context of the Righteous Servant, so highlighting the contrast between ἀνομία and δικαιοσύνη.

<sup>19</sup>Gutbrod, op. cit., p.1085.

<sup>20</sup>H. Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke (transl. by G. Buswell), London, 1960, pp. 90-92 is not convincing when he considers ἀνομία in 2:23 originally meant Gentiles but for Luke the Jews (cf. Die Apostelgeschichte, p.29). Why has the writer allowed a survival from his sources to indicate its original meaning, when according to Conzelmann on basis of ἀνομία in Lk 22:37 (= criminal, not non-Jew) and Acts 7:53 the writer has given it a new meaning i.e. of the Jews? What was the old meaning for Luke if not Gentiles?

<sup>21</sup>Gutbrod, ibid., p. 1087.

<sup>22</sup>Rigaux, p.656; Gibling, pp.38,65; Best, p.283; Cranfield, op. cit., pp.233f., says in Paul ἀνομία has the sense of open rebellion, Rom. 6:19; II Cor. 6:14; II.2:3; Tit. 2:14. In fact all these texts can be suitably translated lawlessness.

<sup>23</sup>Against Cranfield, op. cit., p.327 who says both refer to acts: 'doing of lawlessness ... would have as its consequences more and more lawlessness', cf. Moule, p.68, = leading to. However as τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ is immediately prior to ἀνομία and refers, it seems, to a state, the same applies to the latter. The state of ἀνομία leads to lawlessness. Gutbrod refers the state to the second, ibid.

<sup>24</sup>II Cor. 6:14f.; Mt. 13:39,41 and I Jn. 3:4,8.

<sup>25</sup>Compare the link with 'uncleanness' Mt. 23:28; Rom. 6:19 or the opposite 'purifying', Tit. 2:14; I Jn. 3:3; cf. too 'redeeming from' Tit. 2:14.

<sup>26</sup>In the affirmative, G. Kittel, 'Der Jakobusbrief und die Apostolischen Väter', Z.N.W. 43 (1951/52) 54-112, p.74 (He almost turns the word into an 'Anomia concept'); I. de la Potterie, 'Le péché, c'est l'iniquité (I Joh. III, 4)', Nouvelle Revue Théologique, 78 (1956) 785-797; H. Kosmala, Hebräer - Essener - Christen (Studia Post Biblica, 1), Leiden, 1959, p.196.

<sup>27</sup>See the comments of A. Sand, 'Die Polemik gegen "Gesetzlosigkeit" im Evangelium nach Matthäus u. bei Paul', B.Z. 14 (1970) 112-125, p.123. Anomia is not a specific offence in Mt. (including 23:28) but the self-surrender to the opposing godless power of disaster (Unheils) and worthlessness.

<sup>28</sup>Op. cit., p.790.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid. p.790.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid , p.787f. In Biblical Greek, he argues, the word loses a direct connection with the law cf. Ps. 31:1; 50:4 etc. where it is the equivalent of ἁμαρτία ; similarly in Judaism and Early Christianity, 1 En. 97:6; Ps.Sol. 1:8; I Clem. 8:3; Hermas, Vis. II.2:2. The N.T. has this sense except for O.T. citations where it is in the plural. Hostility and revolt against God's kingdom in the last times is characterized by a Satanic aspect. For the latter he cites from Qumran (p. 789) IQS 1:23-24; IQH 3:12,18; cf. IQM 4:9.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid ., p.794, committing sin is iniquity because it reveals one as a son of the devil, opposed to God and Christ. All this is in an eschatological framework, 2:18,28; cf. 3:2. A.W. Argyle's view, '1 John iii.4f.', E.T. 65 (1953/54) 62-63, that ἁμαρτία and ἄνομία are virtually identical has nothing to commend it. The statement then becomes tautologous. Nor does Schnackenburg's, op. cit., p.187, translation of Sin as Bosheit (malice) . By this he means, with de la Potterie, the Christian who sins shows he is an ally of Satan, a child of the devil (3:9,10), p.186.

<sup>32</sup>Staab, p.51. Getzetzlosigkeit; man without law or opposes himself against the law.

<sup>33</sup>Gen.of Quality, Moulton-Turner, pp. 212-214: 'a feature of biblical Greek', in which a genitive provides an attribute normally supplied by an adj. In our passages 'Man of lawlessness' = 'The Lawless Man' (Bl.-Deb. para. 165).

<sup>34</sup>It could be possibly found in Hellenistic Greek, cf. Moulton-Turner, p.208, but this is more with reference to family relationships. The genitive of quality argues for an origin in Biblical Greek, ibid ., pp. 212f.

<sup>35</sup>Dt. 15:9, Belial = ἀνόμους ; III Kgdms 20 (21):13, A reads ἀποστασία + ἄνδρες.

<sup>36</sup>Dt. 13:14 (13), παράνομοι ; I Kgdms. 2:12, λοιποί.

<sup>37</sup>R.E. Brown, 'The Semitic Background of the New Testament MYSTERION (I)' Bib. 39 (1958) 426-448, p.434.

<sup>38</sup>Brown, ibid , p.434.

<sup>39</sup>Pp. 66ff.

<sup>40</sup>Best, ad loc.



<sup>41</sup>For a discussion of the Antichrist theme and background W. Bousset, The Antichrist Legend; Die Offenbarung Johannis (Meyer, 2nd edn.), Göttingen, 1906, p.377; 'Antichrist' in Enc. Bib., I, Cols. 177-184; Bousset-Gressman, op. cit., pp. 254ff. R.H. Charles, The Ascension of Isaiah, London, 1900, pp. li - lxxiii; with modifications, The Revelation of St. John (I.C.C. Vol. II), Edinburgh, 1920, pp. 76-87. J. Ernst, op. cit. The latter is a very complete survey of the passages considered to lie behind the Antichrist figure. B. Rigaux, pp. 259-280 and L'Antéchrist. M. Rist, 'Antichrist' in I.D.B., I, pp. 140-143. R. Schnackenburg, op. cit., pp. 259-280, Exkurs 7, pp. 145-149; Volz, op. cit., p.73. Von Dobschütz, pp. 291ff. Other articles are found in Dictionaries of the Bible and all major commentaries.

<sup>42</sup>Behind Is. 14 and Ezek. 28 lie older traditions from mythology, cf. Ernst, pp. 209f. and especially pp. 251-263 and M.K. Wakeman, God's Battle with the Monster, Leiden, 1973, pp. 55-82. For mythical origins in the O.T. see references to Rahab, Is. 51:9f., Leviathan, Ps. 74:14; Behemoth, Job. 40:19 and the Dragon, Job 7:12; Ps. 44:20. Although we have references to myths, the original myths have, to a large extent, been denuded in the O.T. and it is unlikely that Paul has been influenced directly by them. On the other hand Is. 14, Ezek. 28 and Dan. passim find a detectable echo in Paul's Anomos figure. Cf. too, A.H. Keane 'The Origin of the Babylonian Dragon Myth' in Bousset, The Antichrist Legend, pp. xi-xxvi.

<sup>43</sup>This passage may preserve the Canaanite form of a nature myth, telling of the attempt of the morning star, to scale heaven but to be cast down by the sun, cf. H. Gunkel, Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit, Göttingen, 1895, pp. 133f. This is applied to the tyrant. See R.B.Y. Scott, 'The Book of Isaiah' in I.B., V, p. 261f. and E.J. Young, The Book of Isaiah (New International Commentary on the O.T., Vol. I), Grand Rapids, Mich. 1965, p.440. O. Kaiser, Isaiah, 13-39 (transl. by R.A. Wilson), London, 1973 feels that the Ugaritic myths only illuminate individual points of the text and do not provide parallels, pp. 38ff.

<sup>44</sup>The idea goes back to Gen. 3:5, Ernst, op. cit., p.37 and see pp. 241ff. (on Gen. 3). We have already suggested that Paul's use of  $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\alpha\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omega$ , 2:3, was influenced by Gen. 3, cf. chp. 4. Whilst there is no direct link with that O.T. passage the thought of rebellion and aspiration to be like gods in Genesis is very suggestive of the ideas in 2:4.

<sup>45</sup>Cf. S.Or. V. 272.

<sup>46</sup>Young, op. cit., p.441.

<sup>47</sup>B.D.B. s.v. □ 17 Hiph. 1(d) 'set up', 'erect'; 1(f) 'lift up', 'exalt' Prov. 3:35; 1 Sam. 2:10; Ps. 92:11.

<sup>48</sup>So O. Kaiser, op. cit., p.28 and E.J. Kissane, The Book of Isaiah, Vol. I, Dublin, 1960, p.161. Cf. the opening statement of v.14 for support.

<sup>49</sup>Young, op. cit., pp. 439, 442.

<sup>50</sup>It also reflects the pattern of Gen. 3, J.W. Wevers, Ezekiel (N. Cen. B.), London, 1969, p.213.

<sup>51</sup>H.G. May, 'The Book of Ezekiel' in I.B., VI, p.217.

<sup>52</sup>May, ibid, p.218, and W. Eichrodt, Ezekiel, London, 1970, p.390.

<sup>53</sup>A.W. Blackwood, Ezekiel: Prophecy of Hope, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1965, says that although some scholars consider the phrase 'I am a god' implies a Tyrian belief in the deity of kings, this is not Ezekiel's emphasis. 'He shows a man, endowed by God with superb talents and opportunities who takes credit to himself for using the gifts God has given to him'.

<sup>54</sup>Theodotion's text of Dan. 11:36f. is considered to be behind II.2:4. The LXX more faithfully renders the M.T. for v.36 (e.g. it has 'God of gods', which Theod. omits). For v.37 Theod. follows the M.T. text much more closely: LXX omits 'regard for any god' and adds after  $\psi\omega\theta\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ ; καὶ ὑπο-  
 $\tau\alpha\gamma\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$  αὐτῷ ἐθνὴ ἰσχυρά. For v.38 Theod. follows M.T. As Paul does not give an actual quotation from Daniel it is impossible to draw a firm conclusion. Cf. for possible allusions, Dan. 2:44 (I Cor. 15:24); 2:47 (I Cor. 14:25); 7:13 (I.4:17); 7:22 (I Cor. 6:2); 12:1 (Phil. 4:3) see too 12:3 (Eph. 2:15); 6:21 (II Tim. 4:17). See further, J.B. Orchard, 'St. Paul and the Book of Daniel', Bib. 20 (1939) 172-179. Irrespective of the version used by Paul all four elements are found in Dan. 11:36,37.

<sup>55</sup>Claiming Deity. V.38 does not oppose this. It asserts that the king will only respect the tangible i.e. fortresses.

<sup>56</sup>J.A. Montgomery, The Book of Daniel (I.C.C.), Edinburgh, 1927, p.388, suggests we read  $\mu\iota\rho\omega$  : dittography according to S.B. Frost, 'Abomination that makes desolate' in I.D.B., I, p.14.

<sup>57</sup>So Montgomery, op. cit., p.390.

<sup>58</sup>Preferred by Montgomery, op. cit., p.388 and A. Jeffrey, 'The Book of Daniel' in I.B., VI, p.476 (on 8:13).

<sup>59</sup>B.D.B. s.v. זָדוֹן give these two meanings but say the connection of the two meanings is not clear.

<sup>60</sup>S.R. Driver, 'The Abomination of Desolation' in H.D.B., I, pp. 12ff. says the "exigencies of the sense" oblige us to treat it in this way.

<sup>61</sup>Ibid, p.13; cf. I Mac. 4:38, καὶ εἶδον τὸ ἁγίασμα ἡρηγυμένον καὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον βεβηλωμένον καὶ τὰς θύρας κατακεκαυρένας κ.τ.λ.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid, p.13.

<sup>63</sup>H.H. Rowley, 'The Bilingual Problem of Daniel', Z.A.W. 50 (1932) 256-268, p.265. He does acknowledge that no examples of זָדוֹן with the meaning of madness are used in the O.T. but cf. Mid. Rabba on Cant. 4:7.

<sup>64</sup>Frost, ibid, p.13.

<sup>65</sup>Op. cit., p.12.

<sup>66</sup>J.C. Dancy, A Commentary on I Maccabees, Oxford, 1954, p.79

<sup>67</sup>ἡκοδόμησεν βδέλυγμα ἐρηρώσεως ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον.

<sup>68</sup>F.M. Abel, Les Livres des Maccabées, 2nd edn., Paris, 1949, pp. 28f. Cf. N. Porteous, Daniel, London, 1965, p.143 suggests a baetyl was placed on the corner of the altar of burnt offering for sacrifices to Zeus Olympios.

<sup>69</sup>S.A. Cook, The Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Light of Archaeology (Schweich Lectures for 1925), London, 1931, pp. 17-25, 155-160.

<sup>70</sup>According to Dancy, ibid, p.79, cf. S.A. Cook, ibid, p.196 for the Arabian inscription.

<sup>71</sup>Proposed by E. Nestle 'Zu Daniel', Z.N.W. 4 (1884) 247-250, p.284. Cf. Philo of Byblos in Eusebius, Praep. evang. i.10.7, βεῖλσαρχὴν ὃ ἐστὶ παρὰ φοῖνιξιν κύριος οὐρανῶν, Ζεὺς δὲ παρ' Ἀλλήσιν.

<sup>72</sup>Sanh. 63 mentioned by S. Zeitlin, The First Book of Maccabees, 1950, p.124.

<sup>73</sup>Op. cit., p.47.

<sup>74</sup>M. Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism (transl. by J. Bowden, Vol. I), London, 1974, pp. 285ff. has put the whole matter of the alleged claims to deity into perspective. Titles from the emperor cult (e.g. 'God Manifest') were used from 173/2 B.C. onwards on coins, but there is no uniformity throughout the coinage. Any approximation of the features of Antiochus with those of Zeus which appeared on the coins is not deliberate. There is no evidence for any identification of Antiochus with Zeus (from available material). He concludes that the king probably followed the policy of his predecessors. The two chief gods were Zeus and Apollo to which the emperor cult was linked but on political grounds. He may have intended a syncretistic imperial cult.

<sup>75</sup>Josephus refers to a letter sent by the Samaritans, addressing Antiochus IV as, Θεὸς Ἐπιφανής. He replied simply 'King Antiochus ...', (xii.262).

<sup>76</sup>Hengel, op. cit., Vol. II, p.189 n.175 says 'speaking great things' (Dan. 7:8 etc.) could refer to the claims of Antiochus found on some of his coins - Θεὸς Ἐπιφανής.

<sup>77</sup>An interesting passage occurs in Dan. 8:23f. At the latter time (לְאַחֲרָיוֹ ; LXX ἐκ' ἐσχάτου (Theod. ἐσχάτων)), when the transgressors have come to the full a king appears who proceeds to act against God's people. The reference to transgressors suggests a situation comparable to the one occurring at the appearance of the Anomos. Lawless sinners will become the followers of the Lawless one. The LXX and Theod. have impersonalised the reference, πληρουμένων τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν. The king (in Daniel) proceeds when the time is right. Cf. Lk. 21:24 (an echo of Dan. 8:23 and 12:7; Tob. 14:5.)

<sup>78</sup>For a study of these chapters in relation to the Antichrist figure, Ernst, op. cit., pp. 198-205.

<sup>79</sup>H.H. Rowley, The Relevance of the Apocalyptic, 3rd edn., London, 1963, p.34.



<sup>80</sup>No known historical equivalent has been found so far for the name of Gog, W. Eichrodt, op. cit., p.522, Rowley, op. cit., pp.37f. and Ernst, op. cit., pp.200ff., who summarizes historical mythical and symbolic views of the figure.

<sup>81</sup>Quite rightly Wevers, op. cit., p.283, writes of unfulfilled prophecies which in their present form have taken on an eschatological form.

<sup>82</sup>In Ezek. 38:2 'land of Magog' is usually regarded as secondary, Eichrodt, op. cit., p.286. The name probably comes from Gen. 10:2 where Magog is one of the sons of Japhet. It could possibly mean 'land of Gog'.

<sup>83</sup>The LXX has Gog for Agag, Num. 24:7 and cf. Am. 7:1. In Judaism Jub. 8:25; S.Or. III. 319,512; I En. 56 cf. 90:16-19; As.Mos. 10:4-7; II Bar. 70:7-10; 4 Ezra. 13:5,33f. See Volz, op. cit., p.175f.

<sup>84</sup>For the idea of forces from the North coming against Israel see Joel 2:20; Zech. 14.

<sup>85</sup>p.37.

<sup>86</sup>Ezek. 38/39 do not appear to be a stage in the figure of Antiochus in Daniel. There are two points of contact in thought (a) Gog and Antiochus make war on God's people, Ezek. 38:10,14; 39:4; Dan. 7:21 et al. (b) By implication Gog has profaned God's name, Ezek. 39:7 as Antiochus has desecrated the place where God has His name, Dan. 11:31.

<sup>87</sup>They are thought likely to have been composed between 63-30 B.C. in Palestine, O. Eissfeldt, The Old Testament, An Introduction (transl. by P.R. Ackroyd), Oxford, 1966. D.S. Russell, op. cit., pp. 57f. accepts the same period but is prepared to date it soon after 48 B.C., if 2:26f. refers to Pompey's death (with G.B. Gray in A.P., II, p.630).

<sup>88</sup>See also Ant. xiv. 69ff. and B.J. i.148ff. In B.J. Josephus states it took Pompey three months to get into the Temple after he had been allowed through the city gates (63. B.C.). Many were slain who had fled to the sanctuary or who were continuing the ritual (hence the reference to the altar in the Psalms). He says it deeply affected the people to see the ἱερόσταν ἔγνων exposed to alien eyes, i.152. In Ant. he writes of the sin against the sanctuary (περὶ τὸν ναόν). Tacitus, Hist. V.9 says Pompey was first to set foot in their Temple by right of conquest.

On the whole episode E. Schurer, The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (ed. G. Vermes-F. Miller, Vol. I), Edinburgh, 1973, pp.238ff.

<sup>89</sup>W. Neil, 'I and II Thessalonians' in Peake's Commentary on the Bible (ed. M Black and H.H. Rowley), London 1962, p.1000, Frame, p.273, Charles, Ascension, pp.111ff.

<sup>90</sup>Cf. however 2:29 where he is considered to have aspired to be 'lord of land and sea' and failed to see that it is God who is great.

<sup>91</sup>Cf. Philo, Leg. ad. Gaium, 188 ἀνδριάντα κολοσσαίων ἐσωτάτω τῶν ὀδύτων ἀνατεθῆναι and Schürer, op.cit., pp.396ff.

<sup>92</sup>Charles, Revelation, p.78; Ernst latterly, op.cit., p.40.

<sup>93</sup>Op.cit., p.22

<sup>94</sup>B.W. Bacon, The Gospel of Mark: Its Composition and Date, New Haven, 1925, suggests that Paul used an Apocalypse based on the profanation of the Temple in Daniel and the attempt to set up an image in the Temple by Caligula. Later it became the Markan apocalypse. The original was issued by a prophet, see pp.85ff., 126ff.; cf. similarly F.W. Beare, The Earliest Records of Jesus, Oxford, 1962, p.216, vv.14-20 antedate Caligula's death 41 A.D. C.H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments, London, 1936, pp. 81-85: Caligula might be a basis for II.2:3ff. and Mk. 13. F.C. Grant, The Gospels: Their Origin and Growth, London, 1959, pp. 100f.: vv.6-8, 14-20, 24-27 were filled out with sayings, perhaps from Q and going back to Christ; S.E. Johnson, The Gospel According to St. Mark (Bl. N.T.C.) London, 1960, pp.209f.; vv.5-8, 14-20, 24-27 were Christian prophecy at the time of the crisis.

<sup>95</sup>Assuming Paul wrote it, but cf. J.A. Fitzmyer, 'Paul and the Interpolated Paragraph in 2 Cor. 6:14 - 7:1', C.B.Q. 33 (1961), 271-280, p.279 who thinks this section is a passage with Qumran ideas, re-worked by a Christian and interpolated.

<sup>96</sup>Bousset, ibid, p. 153f.

<sup>97</sup>See D.W. Thomas, 'לֵבִי in the O.T.' in Biblical and Patristic Studies (ed. J.N. Birdsall-R.W. Thomson), Freiburg, 1963, pp. 11-19, 15.

<sup>98</sup>B.D.B. s.v. לֵבִי : לֵבִי (worth, use profit) and P. Jotien, 'Belial', Bib. 5 (1924) 178-183, p.182.



<sup>99</sup>T.K. Cheyne, 'The Developments of the Meanings of Belial', Exp. V,1, 435-439, p.437. Cf. Thomas, op. cit., p.18f. who takes it as 'the swallower' or 'the abyss that engulfs'.

<sup>100</sup>T.H. Gaster, 'Belial' in I.D.B., I, p.377.

<sup>101</sup>On Belial see further. W. Bousset-T.K. Cheyne, 'Belial' in Enc. Bib., I, Cols. 525-527 (Basically Cheyne's work). W. Foerster, 'βελίας' in T.D.N.T., I, p.607.

<sup>102</sup>Jodén, op. cit., p.179 believes 'Belial' denotes "un (être) sans valeur" rather than an abstract noun "valeur".

<sup>103</sup>Op. cit., p. 377.

<sup>104</sup>Ibid; Cheyne, op. cit., p.437, treats it as a personal name for Satan, cf. II Sam. 23:6; Job 34:18.

<sup>105</sup>For Beliar and other synonyms, Volz, pp. 79f.; Bousset-Gressmann, pp. 332ff.

<sup>106</sup>Eissfeldt, op. cit., p.608 suggests a date of ca. 100 B.C.; Rowley, Relevance, p.65, 2nd cen. B.C.

<sup>107</sup>A.-M. Denis, op. cit., pp. 157f.

<sup>108</sup>Charles in A.P. II, p.9.

<sup>109</sup>Beliar: 1:20; 15:23 ('sons of Beliar').

<sup>110</sup>Satan: 23:29; 50:5, Satan (adversary?) in parallel with evil destroyer, evil one respectively. 40:9; 46:2 speak of no Satan or evil during the time of Joseph. Almost certainly a proper name.

<sup>111</sup>Mastema: A very common name in Jubilees for the chief of evil spirits, 10:8; called 'prince', 11:5,11; 17:16; 18:9,12; 48:2,9,12,15; see also 19:28.

<sup>112</sup>Y. Yadin's translation, The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness, Oxford, 1962, p.322. Belial has to be read as a proper name in IQM. 13:11. The thought of Belial corrupting is very similar to Jub. 10:8 with reference to Mastema and his spirits. In the same place too, 10:9, God allows a tenth part of the demons to work evil.

<sup>113</sup>But in 1<sup>20</sup> it talks of the spirit of Beliar accusing God's people. Reminiscent of Job 2:4ff.

<sup>114</sup>See chp.1 fn.35. A Christian framework cannot be denied but much of the character of it appears to be Jewish, see Russell, op. cit., pp. 55ff.

<sup>115</sup>Beliar: T. Reub. 2:2; 4:7,11; 6:3; T. Sim. 5:3; T. Lev. 3:3; 18:12; 19:1; T. Jud. 25:3; T. Iss. 6:1; 7:7; T. Zeb. 9:8; T. Dan 1:7; 4:7; 5:1,10,11; T. Naph. 2:6; 3:1; T. Ash. 1:8; 3:2; 6:4; T. Jos. 7:4; 20:2; T. Benj. 3:3; 4:8; 6:1,7; 7:1,2.

<sup>116</sup>Satan, T. Dan. 3:6; 5:6; 6:1; T. Gad. 4:7; T. Ash 6:4. Other possible names: Devil, T. Naph. 8:4; Prince of Deceit, T. Jud. 19:4; T. Sim. 2:7; Prince (of Dan), T. Dan 5:6.

<sup>117</sup>Cf. T. Gad 8:1, 'Judah and Levi, for from them shall the Lord raise up salvation to Israel' also T. Benj. 11:2 (MS.C); T. Sim. 7:2.

<sup>118</sup>Bousset, op. cit., pp. 154,173 believes we have a picture of Beliar coming as Antichrist but Foerster, T.D.N.T., I, p.607 only treats Beliar as a name of the Devil.

<sup>119</sup>On the question of the Messiah(s) in T. XII see R.H. Charles, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, London, 1908, pp. xcviif. who argues that for 20-40 years the expectation of a Levitic Messiah flourished until the hope of a Judaic Messiah re-appeared cf. also G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'The Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', J.Th.S. 48 (1947) 1-12; K.G. Kuhn, 'Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel' in The Scrolls and the New Testament (ed. K. Stendahl), London, 1958, pp. 54-64; M. Black, 'The Messiah in the Testament of Levi XVIII', E.T. 60 (1948/49) 321-322; idem, E.T. (1949/50) 157-158, a reply to J.R. Porter 'The Messiah in the Testament of Levi XVIII', E.T. 61 (1949/50) 90-91. For Qumran evidence, M. Smith, 'What is implied by the variety of Messianic Figures?' J.B.L. 78 (1959) 66-72 and R.E. Brown, 'The Teacher of Righteousness and the Messiah(s) in The Scrolls and Christianity (ed. M. Black), London, 1969, pp. 37-44.

<sup>120</sup>Charles in A.P., II, p.334., on the grounds it is a Christian addition.

<sup>121</sup>See T. Lev. 3:3 (some MSS); Armies in the second part of a tripartite heaven await the Day of Judgment to punish Beliar and his Spirits.

<sup>122</sup>We have a reference to Satan as the Prince of Dan. Charles considers vv.6,7 a reference to the demoralization under

the later Maccabees and the earliest connection of Antichrist with Dan; hence the tribe's omission in Rev. 7:5-8, A.P., II, p.334. Rowley disagrees, p.73.

<sup>123</sup>Fragments have been found from sections 1 (chps. 1-36), 4 (83-90) and 5 (91 +) and probably 3 (72-82) of I Enoch, which means that these are pre-Christian, cf. Milik, Ten Years, p.33 and his most recent discussion on the Enoch fragments, 'Problèmes de la Littérature Hénochique à la Lumière des Fragments Araméens de Qumrân, H.Th.R. 64 (1971) 333-378, pp. 334ff. He considers the Parables of Enoch (37-71) were substituted in the Christian era for the Book of Giants. We ourselves have reservations about quoting chps. 37-71 for pre-Christian thought.

<sup>124</sup>Azazel - especially in 1-36. Cf. further 8:1,2; 9:6; 10:4,8 (causes all sin); 13:1. He appears in the Similitudes, 54:5; 55:4; 69:2 (where he is one of the fallen angels). In Section 4,86:1; 88:1.

<sup>125</sup>Semjaza - Charles in A.P., II, p.191, notes the confusion of leadership with Azazel, since in 69:2 he appears as leader. Perhaps a cycle of Semjaza myths has crept into 6:3-8; 8:1-3; 9:7; 10:11.

<sup>126</sup>Probably the first part of 1st. cen. A.D., cf. Russell, op. cit., pp. 58f.

<sup>127</sup>Charles in A.P., II, p.421.

<sup>128</sup>R.H. Charles, The Assumption of Moses, London, 1897, p.85.

<sup>129</sup>E.g. IV:4; XVI:2; XX:1; XXIII:1; cf. XVII:1.

<sup>130</sup>On the date Chp. 1, fn. 35.

<sup>131</sup>Charles, Ascension, p.25.

<sup>132</sup>Apart from II.167f. (Hennecke) the translations are by Lanchester in A.P., II. S.Or. III.62-92 is the latter part of the 1st century according to Lanchester, p.371 but Bousset treats Sebaste in III.63 as a reference to Augustus and dates the section prior to B.C. 30, pp. 96f. This Sibyl, he adds, presupposes an earlier description, i.e. II.167f. Charles dates this ca. 200 A.D., Ascension, p.lxiv. He dates the references in Sibyls IV and V ca. 80 and 71-74 A.D. respectively, pp. lixf. Russell, op. cit., pp. 54f. says Bks. III, IV, V are Jewish with Christian interpolations with III.63-92 1st cen. A.D.

<sup>133</sup>Ascension, p.26: vv.4ff. refer to Antichrist and vv.2,3 the historical Nero. He considers 3:12-5:1a = The Testament of Hezekiah; dates ca. 88-100 A.D., p.xliv, also A.P., II, pp. 155f.

<sup>134</sup>Cf. VIII.200. Cleopatra is suggested for the widow but Bousset prefers a recollection of the mythical sea monster originally conceived as female, p.99.

<sup>135</sup>Lanchester, A.P. II, p.371 argues, in our view with more probability, that Sebaste is probably Samaria and the reference could be to Simon Magus as Belial or Antichrist, although he gives no proof of this suggestion.

<sup>136</sup>See Fitzmyer, op. cit., Gnika, op. cit.; A.R.C. Leane, The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning, London, 1966, pp. 126f.; P. von der Osten-Sacken, Gott und Belial (Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments, 6), Göttingen, 1968.

<sup>137</sup>Azazel appears in 4Q Ages (4Q180) 1:7,8; 'Azazel and his angels', and 4QHén<sup>a</sup> 1.III:9 and 4QHén<sup>c</sup> 1.II:26 (?)

<sup>138</sup>H.W. Huppenbauer, 'Belial in den Qumrantexten', Th.Z. 15 (1959), 81-89.

<sup>139</sup>Op. cit., pp. 34ff., 42ff.

<sup>140</sup>Ibid, pp. 116ff.

<sup>141</sup>Ibid, pp. 190ff; CD. 4:13,15; 5:18; 8:2; 12:2; 19:14.

<sup>142</sup>Ibid, pp. 206ff.

<sup>143</sup>See further, 4QF1.1:8,9; 2:2; 4QTest. 23(?); 4Qp Ps.37. 2:10; 4Q Tan. II.8-11:15(?); 4QCata<sup>a</sup>. 1-4:10; 10-11:4; 12-13:4,6,7.

<sup>144</sup>The Antichrist Legend.

<sup>145</sup>The Ascension of Isaiah, and Revelation.

<sup>146</sup>L'Antéchrist.

<sup>147</sup>Die Gegenspieler.

<sup>148</sup>Op. cit., pp. 252ff.

<sup>149</sup>For both points see pp. 13ff., 155. The view is thought plausible by M.R. James, 'Man of Sin and Antichrist' in H.D.B., III, p.227. Neil has no doubt it gives us a truer appreciation of the mythological and Jewish background of Antichrist, (Moffatt), p.xxii.

<sup>150</sup>Pp. 137, 169ff.

<sup>151</sup>Pp. 171f.

<sup>152</sup>Pp. 160ff.

<sup>153</sup>Pp. 175ff. Die Offenbarung Johannis (Meyer, 2nd edn.), p.377.

<sup>154</sup>Pp. 224ff.

<sup>155</sup>See A.H. Askwith, An Introduction to the Thessalonian Epistles, London, 1902, pp. 119, 121f. He says that even if in II Cor. 6:15 Beliar = Antichrist and I Jn. 2:18 ἀντίχριστος = a technical name, it does not prove a Jewish expectation of an anti-Messiah.

<sup>156</sup>See fn. 150.

<sup>157</sup>Rome or Nero were regarded as the Antichrist power, pp. 126ff.

<sup>158</sup>P.22.

<sup>159</sup>P.155.

<sup>160</sup>It is only fair to mention that in his article 'Antichrist' in Enc. Relig. Ethics, I, pp. 578ff. Bousset partly remedied his views by concentrating more on historical antecedents and less on the Beliar myth. The guiding thought, he argues, is that the figure of 'Antichrist' came to be separated from the historical figure of Antiochus IV and became the figure of the God-opposing tyrant, seen now and again in history (e.g. Pompey, Caligula, Nero). In II.2:3f. The Man of Lawlessness (Beliar?) remains, in his opinion, a false Messiah.

<sup>161</sup>P.77.

<sup>162</sup>Pp. 77-79.

<sup>163</sup>Ascension, p.lvi.



<sup>164</sup>pp. 80-87 for this paragraph.

<sup>165</sup>p.81f. Charles speaks of Beliar appearing as Antichrist, and Man of *ἀνὸρ* being almost certainly a translation of Beliar.

<sup>166</sup>p.82.

<sup>167</sup>Antiochus IV is an example of a king who used political methods to achieve religious ends, cf. I Mac. 1:13 where the king allowed Jews to follow τὰ δικαιώματα τῶν ἔθνων. This fails so Antiochus forced women who had circumcised their children to be put to death κατὰ τὸ πρόσταγμα, (Syriac adds 'of the King').

<sup>168</sup>E.g. I En. 99:5,7; Jub. 23:19. See Rigaux, pp. 247ff, Hartman, op. cit., pp. 28ff. and Volz, op. cit., pp. 147-163 on signs of the End.

<sup>169</sup>Cf. A.L. Moore, Parousia.

<sup>170</sup>For a summary of views on Mk.13 and the Synoptic Apocalypse in general, see G.R. Beasley-Murray, Jesus and the Future, London, 1954, and for more recent views, R. Pesch, Naherwartungen, Düsseldorf, 1968, pp. 21-47. Virtually all scholars hold to the theory of an earlier source. Hartmann, op. cit. refers to a pre-Markan exposition of Daniel upon which the evangelist had drawn. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, pp. 122f., 401ff., considers vv.7f., 12,14-22, 24-27 constitute Jewish apocalyptic sayings from an Apocalypse and Pesch talks of an apocalyptic pamphlet. (Flugblatt) for which he mentions vv.6,22,7b,8,12,13b, 14-17, 18?, 19-20a, 24-27, ibid., pp. 207ff. On the other hand J. Lambrecht, Die Redaktion der Markus-Apokalypse: Literarische Analyse und Strukturuntersuchung (Analecta Biblica,28), Rome, 1967 rejects the theory of a reworked apocalypse and asserts, pp.263-297, that we have a unified work whose structure and function is due to the redactor. For his view and criticism, Pesch, pp. 41ff. Nevertheless Lambrecht does believe Q and the O.T. are used as sources, pp. 257ff. Another view concentrates on the use of logia or groups of logia as the source for Mk.13. See V. Taylor, 'The Apocalyptic Discourse of Mk. 13', E.T. 60 (1948/49) 94-98; idem, The Gospel According to St. Mark, London, 1952, pp. 636-644 (4 groups of sayings, vv. 5-8, 24-27; 9-13; 14-23; 28-37); J. Schmid, The Gospel According to Mark (The Regensburg N.T. transl. by K. Condon), New York, 1968, pp. 231ff.; J. Jeremias, New Testament Theology, Pt. I (transl. by J. Bowden), London, 1971, p. 126; W. Marksen, Der Evangelist Markus, Göttingen, 2nd edn., 1959, p. 101ff. and L. Gaston, No Stone on Another (Nov. T. Suppl. 23), Leiden, 1970 pp. 25f, 61ff. who argues for prophetic sayings as the basis of Mk.13. Marxsen and he agree that vv. 14ff. originated from the time of Caligula. Apart from Lambrecht the general conclusion is



that Mark has drawn upon earlier apocalyptic material whether in the form of a Jewish (-Christian) Apocalypse or logia. Many scholars consider the origin of the former arose from the time of Caligula. Pesch denies though that Paul has used a source behind Mk. 13, ibid., pp. 214f.

<sup>171</sup>Marxsen, Markus, p.123 and Gaston, op. cit., pp. 27f. think we have a reference to Antichrist.

<sup>172</sup>T.J. Weeden, Mark - Traditions in Conflict, Philadelphia, 1971, p.91 says there is general agreement that v.7f., 14-20, 24-27 belong to an apocalyptic source.

<sup>173</sup>Conzelmann, Theology of Luke, p.135, n.1.

<sup>174</sup>D. Daube, The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism, London, 1956, pp. 425ff., 432. Marxsen on the other hand believes the writer is drawing attention to the grammatical anomaly of the masculine participle, op. cit., pp. 27f.

<sup>175</sup>See T.F. Glasson, 'Mk xiii and the Greek Old Testament' E.T. 69 (1957/58) 213-215, p.214f. who suggests 13:7 = Dan. 2:28; 13:14 = Dan. 12:11; 11:31; 13:19 = Dan. 12:12f. (?). For the great influence of Daniel on the N.T. writers see J. Bowman, The Gospel of Mark (Studia Post-Biblica 8); Leiden, 1965, pp. 241ff. Examples of references in a N.T. eschatological setting are Dan. 2:45 (Theod.) = Mt. 24:6; Dan. 3:6 = Mt. 13:42,50; Dan. 4:12,21 = Mt. 13:32; Dan. 7:22 = Lk. 21:8; Dan. 9:26; 12:7 = Lk. 21:24; Dan. 12:3. - Mt. 13:43.

<sup>176</sup>See Rigaux, pp. 98-101 and G.R. Beasley-Murray, op. cit., pp. 232f.

<sup>177</sup>Words in brackets refer to Mt. 24.

<sup>178</sup>For Rigaux's own appraisal on all the parallels he lists, see pp. 104f. He rejects any written dependence of Paul on Mk. Rather, he suggests, both may depend on a discourse of Jesus taken up in the primitive preaching.

<sup>179</sup>Which is partly why J.B. Orchard, 'Thessalonians and the Synoptic Gospels', Bib. 19 (1938) 19-42 connects any parallels with the redaction of the discourse in Matthew. See pp. 33ff. for II.2:1ff and Mt. He concludes that the evidence shows literary dependence. Cf. on the relationship of Paul and Matthew, C.H. Dodd, New Testament Studies, Manchester, 1953, pp. 54-57. J.P. Brown, 'Synoptic Parallels in the Epistles and Form-History', N.T.S. 10 (1963/64) 27-48 argues that in I and II the author has turned a nucleus of sayings (later found in Mk) into exhortation. In fact Mk. has used the Thessalonian apocalypse with Q material. According to A.W. Argyle, 'Parallels between the Pauline Epistles and Q',

E.T. 60 (1948/49) 318-320 asserts Paul knew of tradition behind Q, although he does not deal with Mk. 13 or II.2. Later, 'M and the Pauline Epistles' E.T. 81 (1969/70) 340-342, he thinks Pauline parallels with M (e.g. I.4:16 with Mt. 24:31 (the trumpet) strengthens the authenticity of M. One of the most thorough articles on the subject was written by E. Cothenet, 'La II<sup>e</sup> Épître aux Thessaloniens et l'Apocalypse Synoptique', R.de S.R. 42 (1954) 5-39. He suggests that Paul based, in part, what he said on Mt. 24:3-27, perhaps in Aramaic, pp. 37,39. D.M. Stanley, 'Pauline Allusions to the Sayings of Jesus', C.B.Q. 33 (1961) 26-39. Dealing with, for example, I.5:1-3 and Mt. 24:9,36,43f. but not II.2:1ff., he concludes that Paul was familiar with materials preserved in the oral tradition.

<sup>180</sup>See fn. 94

<sup>181</sup>R.H. Shaw denies any link with Mk. 13, 'A conjecture on the Signs of the End', Anglican Theological Review 47 (1965) 96-102.

<sup>182</sup>This view was common among the church fathers, Hippolytus, de Antichristo 6, Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. V.25.3, Commodian, Cyril, Cat. XV. More recently Boussett, pp. 166ff.; E. Cothenet, op. cit., pp. 27f.; von Dobschütz with reservations, p.273; Oepke, p.152 (Jewish false prophet) and Best, p.284 'the title (i.e. Man of rebellion) may suggest some figure coming out of Judaism'.

<sup>183</sup>For our argument, it does not matter whether we connect καρποὶα to any of the following three statements vv.9,10.

<sup>184</sup>Eph. 1:19; 3:7; 4:16; Phil. 3:21; Col. 1:29; 2:12. In I Cor. 12:10 it is a vario lectio for ἐνέργημα, cf. too the D text of Acts 4:24, the church ἐκτελούντες τὴν τοῦ ἐνέργειαν.

<sup>185</sup>For the Active trans. I Cor. 12:6; Gal. 3:5; Eph. 1:11,20; 2:2;

<sup>186</sup>For the magical references as well as those in Wis. 7:17,26; 13:4; 18:22, and III Mac. 3:29; 4:21; 5:12,28, see G. Bertram, 'ἐνέργημα (- εἶα)' in T.D.N.T., II, pp. 652-654.

<sup>187</sup>I Cor. 12:6,11; Gal. 2:8 (bis); 3:5; Phil. 2:13a; Eph. 1:11,20.

<sup>188</sup>Eph. 2:2.

<sup>189</sup>Mt. 14:2 = Mk. 6:14; Phil. 2:13b.

<sup>190</sup> K.W. Clark, 'The meaning of ἐνερπύεω and κατὰρπύεω in the New Testament', J.B.L. 54 (1935) 93-101, p.95.

<sup>191</sup> The verb has been taken with a middle or passive meaning. Those who have argued for the middle sense include Bertram, op. cit., p.654; Bl.-Deb. paras.148 (1), 316 (1); Moulton-Turner, pp. 55f. (middle which is active with intransitive sense); O. Michel, Der Brief an die Römer (Meyer, 13th edn.), Göttingen, 1966, p.167 n.3; Bauer s.v. ἐνερπύεω, 1.b. The passive is supported by J.B. Mayor, The Epistle of St. James, London, 1913, pp. 177-179; J.A. Robinson, St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, London, 1903, pp. 244f.; J. Ross, 'Ἐνερπύεσθαι in the New Testament', Exp. VII.7. 75-77; Milligan, pp. 141f.; K.W. Clark, op. cit.; Rigaux, pp. 668f. It is likely that in II.2:7 we have a passive, see chp. 7, pp. 348f.

<sup>192</sup> Op. cit., p.97.

<sup>193</sup> Chrysostom implies this thought: ὁ ἄνθρωπος τις πᾶσαν αὐτοῦ δεινότητα τὴν ἐνερπύειν. Frame, p.253, draws out the force of these words when, with reference to Chrysostom, he writes 'the figure ... is a man, a unique man, however, in whom Satan dwells and operates'. We cannot go as far as Frame (with Theodore) and believe there is a parallel between the incarnation of Christ and the indwelling of Satan in the Anomos. Indwelling as Frame has interpreted it in the quotation, and the incarnation of Jesus as understood by the early church, cf. Phil. 2:5ff.; appear to be two different concepts. On p.268 he compares this indwelling to the 'indwelling spirit of holiness in Christ', Rom. 1:4; a more appropriate idea.

<sup>194</sup> These include crying out, cutting oneself, super-human strength, animals acting in a totally unpredictable fashion, Mk. 5:13, foaming at the mouth, grinding teeth together, 9:20. 9:18 states clearly the motivation of this type of behaviour, 'wherever it (the spirit) takes him'. On the other hand Satanic possession is marked by a quality of deliberateness and rationality which is absent from Synoptic demonism. Also demonism primarily affects the person who is possessed. The whole purpose of the Anomos is to affect others.

<sup>195</sup> CD 12:2f.

<sup>196</sup> So Yadin, op. cit., pp. 230ff. It is a tradition well-established in intertestamental literature and found elsewhere in Qumran writings. I En. 1:9; 12:2; 14:23; 15:7,19; (cf. 6:1ff.); T.Lev. 3:3; T.Naph. 8:4; Jub. 5:1ff.; IQS 2:5f.; 4Q Ages of Creation 1:7f.

<sup>197</sup>Gaster, op. cit., p.377, makes this identification.

<sup>198</sup>Cf. T.Benj. 3:3, let not 'the spirits of Beliar have dominion over you'.

<sup>199</sup>s.v. κολλᾶω 2.c citing this reference.

<sup>200</sup>III Bar. 13:2. Michael says to the righteous, in answer to their request to be free of evil men, 'you cannot depart from them, ἵνα μὴ εἰς τέλος κυριεύσῃ ὁ ἔχθρος'.

<sup>201</sup>There is every reason to believe that this reference reflects typical Jewish thought. T.Naph. 8:2 occurs in the Hebrew Test. of the same name. This may indicate that 8:6 was also known at the same time. Even though Charles (A.P., II, p.339) marks two short expressions as of Christian origin, both could be equally well Jewish, which suggests we have a Jewish setting for 8:6. We need not be surprised by the use of δὶδβολος. It translates יְהוָה in the LXX, Job. 2:1; Zech. 3:1f.; 1 Chron. 21:1.

<sup>202</sup>There is the problem of dating; see chp. 1 fn. 35.

<sup>203</sup>A.P., II, p.160.

<sup>204</sup>For parallels illustrating divine causality I Sam. 1:5; 18:10; 19:9; I Kings 22:21; Judg. 9:23; Is. 6:10.

<sup>205</sup>Satan (name without the article) shows a personality with a will and purpose of his own, J.M. Myers, I Chronicles (Anchor Bible), New York, 1965, p.147. G. von Rad, δὶδβολος in T.D.N.T., II, p.74, considers we have a name not an appellative.

<sup>206</sup>B.D.B. s.v. מִיָּד. Only in the Hiphil: to incite, allure, instigate. In Chronicles it comes to mean 'tempt'.

<sup>207</sup>I En. 10:8. The Qumran author(s) reflected on this question and suggested, IQM 13, that God has appointed from ancient times a Prince to help the Elect, whilst Belial has been created for the pit, along with his spirits, since it is his purpose to achieve wickedness and iniquity. This dualism is further clarified in IQS 3:17ff.:

He has created man to govern the world,  
and has appointed for him two spirits  
in which to walk until the time of His  
visitation: the spirits of truth and



falsehood ... All the children of righteousness are ruled by the Prince of Light ... all the children of falsehood are ruled by the angel of Darkness, (Vermes).

208 Baalam, Num. 24:2; Saul and his messengers I Sam. 19:18ff.

209 M.R. James, 'The Testament of Job' in Apocrypha Anecdota II (ed. J.A. Robinson, Cambridge Texts and Studies, V), Cambridge, 1899, pp. xciiiff. believed the work to come from the hand of a Jewish-Christian in the second or third cen. A.D. His arguments were based on a few alleged parallels with the N.T. He thought, however, that the body of the work was a Hebrew midrash on Job, interspersed with hymnodic episodes from the author's hand. J.B. Frey, 'Apocryphes de l'A.T.' in Dictionnaire de la Bible, Suppl. 1, 1928, p.455 considers the sentiments entirely Jewish and the parallels do not need to be explained by any literary relationship. C.C. Torrey, The Apocryphal Literature, London, 1963 pp.140ff., explained these as merely idioms of Aramaic popular speech, and suggested that an Aramaic original may underlie the text (cf. Job 42:17, LXX), ibid. p.143, cf. C.T. Fritsch, 'Pseudepigrapha' in I.D.B., III, p.961: an Aramaic midrash on Job. S.P. Brock, Testamentum Iobi (Ps. V.T.G. II), Leiden, 1967, p.9, whose text is quoted, points out that only the variants in MS. V have a slightly Semitic flavour which he believes are due to reminiscences of the LXX. Fritsch aligns the book with the Hasidim, K. Kohler, 'The Testament of Job' in Jewish Encyclopedia (ed. I. Singer, Vol. VII), London - New York, pp. 200-202, with the Essenes (so too H. Kosmala, op. cit., p.235 n.6.) Kohler, Torrey, Fritsch decide for a pre-Christian date. Further evidence in A.-M. Denis op. cit., pp. 100-104.

210 MS.S and Slav. read ἐρπλήσθεις. Brock thinks the Paris MS. (P) is the best authority for the whole text, p.8, and as MS. V supports it in this instance ἐρπνευσθείς is probably the correct reading. The variant is an attempt to bring out the nature of Satan's activity. In the LXX ἐρπνέω occurs mainly in Jos. 10,11 where it means 'all who possess life', (10:28,30 etc. cf. S.R. Driver, Deuteronomy (I.C.C.), Edinburgh, 1896, p.239). It is likely that the use of the word for 'possessing life' is a reflection of Gen. 2:7, καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς. In Wis. 15:11 ἐρπνέω is in parallel with ἐρψυσάω and Gen. 2:7 provides the background to the statement.

... Him that inspired into him an active soul (τὸν ἐρπνεύσαντα αὐτῷ ψυχὴν ἐνεργούσαν) And breathed into him a living spirit (ἐρψυσήσαντα πνεῦμα ζωτικόν).

Both verbs serve to emphasize not merely man receiving the breath of life, but God filling a man with His life. On the

anthropology of the verse J. Fitchner, Weisheit Salomos (H.Z.A.T.), Tübingen, 1938, p.57. A curious use of the verb appears in Acts 9:1. Perhaps it stresses not that Paul 'breathed out' (E. Schweizer, 'ἐμπνέω' in T.D.N.T., VI, p.452) but that he filled his mind with threatenings and slaughter which revealed themselves in actions against the disciples (cf. Grimm-Thayer, s.v. ἐμπνέω and E Kamlah, 'Geist' in Begriffslexikon zum N.T., Vol. I, Wuppertal, 1967, p.482. It could be that the author of Test. Job has used the verb as an antithesis to God's action of filling man with his life.

211 ἐν can be instrumental, Mk. 1:23, 'man with an unclean spirit', or possibly 'in the power of', 'in his realm', see Moulton-Turner, p.252 (ii) for the latter. Either way it emphasizes Satanic control. MS.V reads ἐκ τοῦ (for ἐν).

212 Σατανᾶς is used almost exclusively in MSS. P and S. V prefers Πονήρος (never in P) and διαβόλος.

213 See E. Best, The Temptation and the Passion: the Marcan Soteriology (S.N.T.S., 2), Cambridge, 1965, p.8 and T.Naph. 8:4; T.Iss. 7:7; T.Benj. 5:2.

214 Ecclus. 25:24 has opened the door to the identification of the serpent with Satan. Identification is complete in Vit. Ad. 16; cf. II Cor. 11:3; I Tim. 2:14.

215 XLIII.4: part of a hymnodic episode which gives thanks to God for forgiveness. It turns out to be in part a description of Elihu's act and its consequences. A similar description in 4Q 184. It describes the ruin and end of a harlot. No doubt Prov. 2:18ff.; 23:27 are the source of its inspiration.

216 Elihu has left his mark in Rabbinic tradition. See Kohler, 'The Testament of Job. An Essene Midrash on the Book of Job' in Semitic Studies in Memory A. Kohut, Berlin, 1897, p.285. R. Akiba, Jerus. Sota. V.20d identifies him with Balaam.

217 Elihu is said to be a son of darkness XLIII:6, ὁ (MS.V. υἱὸς) τοῦ σκοτεινοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἔστι τοῦ φωτός. A characteristic expression of Qumran, IQM 1:10; IQS 3:13-25; Yadin, op. cit., p.242. Cf. too I.5:5; Lk.16:8; Jn. 12:36; Eph. 5:8. Elihu's destiny can be compared with that of the harlot, 4Q 184:7,8 'she has no inheritance (in the midst of) among all who gird themselves with light'; J.M. Allegro, Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan, Qumran Cave IV, Oxford, 1968, p.83.

218 Liddell-Scott, s.v. ὁρᾶς.



219 Brackets indicate the words are found in the Alchimim (Gizeh) fragment, which is not so original, according to Charles in A.P. II, p.167, as Fragments in Syncellus, and omitted from the Ethiopic. Later the Chester Beatty text for the last chapters of Enoch was found. See M. Black, The Book of Enoch (Ps.V.T.G. III), Leiden, 1970, pp.7ff.

220 Charles, ibid., p.190, commenting on I En. 5:4 says that blasphemy is a frequent charge in chapters 91-104, which he dates B.C. 195-64, p.171, Russell op. cit., pp. 41ff. and Rowley, Relevance of Apoc., op. cit., p.57, date it in the Maccabean period.

221,  $\delta\iota\beta\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  ' in T.D.N.T., II, p.79.

222  $\Delta\iota\beta\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  occurs three times in John (6:70; 8:44; 13:2) and  $\Sigma\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  once (13:27). There is no need to doubt that  $\delta\iota\beta\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  with the article = Satan. This influences an understanding of 6:70 where the word  $\delta\iota\beta\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  can be translated 'slanderer' or 'adversary'. This is inappropriate for the association with 'The Devil', suggests 'one inspired by Satan'; J.H. Bernard, Gospel of St. John (I.C.C., Vol. I), Edinburgh, 1928, pp. 223f. Foerster, op. cit., p.81, also rejects the idea of 'slanderer', 'adversary'.

223 Present in p<sup>66</sup>  $\Delta$  C<sup>2</sup>; omitted by p<sup>75</sup> B C\* D L pc.

224 The time of the 'possession' in Luke and John is different. A useful discussion on the apostasy of Judas is found in S. Brown, Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke (Analecta Biblica 35/36), Rome, 1968, pp. 82-97. He notes that Satan's role in relation to the faithful disciples is described with  $\sigma\iota\nu\iota\delta\omicron\varsigma$  (22:31) not  $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\iota$ , probably because of diabolical possession. He also contrasts the role of Satan with that of demons, p.85.

225 R. Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes (Meyer, 18th edn.), Göttingen, 1964, p.368, goes too far when he sees this verse concerned with Satan himself as the opponent of God and not Satan in Judas.

226 Conzelmann, Theol. of Luke, pp. 16, 28f. 199, has argued that between Lk. 4:13 and 22:3 we have a time without temptation. A new period then begins as indicated by 22:28, 40, 46. Similarly C. Stuhlmüller, 'John' in J.B.C., II, p.156. This has been disputed by S.G. Wilson, 'Lukan Eschatology', N.T.S. 16 (1969/70), 330-347. However Conzelmann has highlighted the importance of Satan's activity just prior to the Passion. C.H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, Cambridge, 1953, pp.408f., has argued persuasively that the darkness mentioned in Lk. 22:53 and Jn. 14:30f. symbolises the dominion of Satan whilst in Jn. 13:31f. Jesus arises to

meet the final enemy rather than Judas. Did Paul see evil spirits as at least one reason for the crucifixion, I Cor. 2:8? (J.M. Creed's suggestion, The Gospel According to St. Luke, London, 1930, p.260).

227 Strack-Billerbeck, II, p.559 on Jn. 13:27 cite Sota 3a where Resch Lachish (ca. 250) is said to have stated, 'Man does not commit sin unless a spirit of infatuation (folly) has entered into him (  $\text{תַּיִטוּשׁ} \quad \text{תִּרְבֵּן}$  ) as it is said, if any man's wife go aside (  $\text{תִּשְׁוֶה} \quad \text{הָאִשָּׁה}$  ) the word is so written it can be read  $\text{תִּשְׁוֶה} \quad \text{תִּרְבֵּן}$ , i.e. an act of folly'. Cf. Test. Job. where Job's wife's name Sitis may be connected to  $\text{שִׁטָּה}$  'roam about' or  $\text{תִּשְׁוֶה}$  'go astray' (Kohler, op. cit., p.273). In Test. Job she was led astray by Satan disguised as a bread-seller.

228 For the  $\aleph$  B text, W. Bauer, Das Johannesevangelium (H.Z.N.T., 2nd edn.), Tübingen, 1925, p.163.

229 For the D text, Bultmann, Ev. Johannes, p.353 n.4. If  $\aleph$  B were original and it was intended that the Devil had put it into his own heart we would expect  $\beta\alpha\lambda\lambda\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota \epsilon\iota\varsigma \nu\omicron\upsilon\nu$ . It cannot be translated, he writes, 'into Judas' heart'. The  $\aleph$  B text is therefore a correction to avoid a contradiction with v.27, according to Bultmann. J.N. Sanders-B.A. Mastin, The Gospel According to St. John (B.L.N.T.C.), London, 1968, p.304 n.5, suggest that for the AK etc. and D readings the '  $\varsigma$  ' may have dropped out accidentally from  $\text{τοῦδε} \varsigma$  : the majority of witnesses have the genitive.

230 L. Morris, The Gospel According to St. John, (New International Comm.), London, 1973, p.614 prefers to read it of the devil making up his mind; also C.K. Barrett, The Gospel According to St. John, London, 1955, p.365.

231 The verb is in the Active voice; it is also a peculiar word to use - 'put'. See R.E. Brown, The Gospel According to St. John (Anchor Bible, Vol. II), London, 1971, p.550 and B. Lindars, The Gospel of John (N.Cen.B.), London, 1972, p.449 for these criticisms. Bernard is right, op. cit., ad loc., in saying that the A K and D texts smooth out the  $\aleph$  B text. Bauer, op. cit., ad loc. also makes the point that the name of Judas may have been left until the end for dramatic effect.

232 Cf. the statement found in T. Sim. 2:7, 'I set my mind against him to destroy him (i.e. Joseph) because the prince of deceit (  $\delta \lambda\epsilon\chi\omega\nu \tau\eta\varsigma \pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\varsigma$  ) sent forth the spirit of jealousy and blinded my mind'.

233 If  $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$  is read, 13:27, (omitted  $\alpha^2$  D L 565 pc it sy<sup>s</sup> sa bo pt) the precise point of Satanic possession is highlighted. Bauer, op. cit., p.170 'Das  $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$  markiert scharf den Moment'.

234 Temptation and Passion, p.22.

235 So T. Ling, The Significance of Satan, London, 1961, p.30.

236 Moulton-Turner, p.260, remark on the use of the preposition in the Johannine literature: it means 'devil-ists', Jn. 8:44; I Jn. 3:8; cf. Jn. 8:23; 15:19; 17:14 which means those not belonging to or possessed by the world. Kimmel, Introduction, p.312: Origin of I John between 90-110 A.D.

237 It is unlikely that the author would contradict himself in 1:7-10 and 3:9. As R. Schnackenburg, op. cit., pp. 190f. writes, there is a tension between the fact of new birth and the life lived out by the Christian. V.6, he goes on to say, explains v.9: The Christian should abide in God. If he did he would not sin. The unbeliever has never abided in God or known His seed within, so he sins.

238 Cf. too Marxsen, Introduction, p.264.

239 S. Brown, op. cit., pp. 98-109 on this pericope, notes the parallels with the apostasy of Judas.

- (1) Satan caused the sin, Lk. 22:3; Acts 5:3.
- (2) Money is the means used by Satan, Lk. 22:5; Acts 1:18; 5:2.
- (3) Sin is punished with sudden death, Acts 1:18; 5:5,10.

240 For the text p<sup>8</sup> A B D E P pl sy cop<sup>sa.bo</sup> et al.  $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\alpha\sigma\epsilon\nu$ , p<sup>74</sup>, two Old lat. MSS., Vg. Athanasius et al.  $\epsilon\kappa\acute{\eta}\rho\omega\sigma\epsilon\nu$   $\lambda^*$ . The evidence overwhelmingly supports the verb  $\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\acute{\omega}$ . For the idea of 'taking full possession' see Ecclus. 9:3; Jn. 16:6; Hermas, Mand. XI.2.  $\delta \psi\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omicron\kappa\rho\upsilon\phi\eta\tau\eta\varsigma \dots \kappa\lambda\eta\rho\acute{o}\tau \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ .

241 W. de Boor speaks of a heart filled previously by the Spirit but filled now by Satan, Die Apostelgeschichte, Wuppertal, 1965, ad loc. In view of 4:8; 6:10 and 13:9, which speak of possession by the Spirit, a contrast is probably intended by the author. Similarly E. Haenchen Die Apostelgeschichte (Meyer, 14th edn.), Göttingen, 1965 ad loc. It is the Holy Spirit and Satan who confront each other, and whose respective instruments Ananias and Peter are.

<sup>242</sup>H.H. Wendt, Die Apostelgeschichte (Meyer, 9th edn.), Göttingen, 1913, pp. 119f. draws attention to the fact that it is assumed by the question, 'Why has Satan filled your heart?' that this need not have happened. Moreover he adds, the sense of the question is, 'Why have you given to the tempter room in your innermost being?' Judas also had a choice of action.

<sup>243</sup>With destruction, Acts 1:18; 5:5. For divine punishment in this way cf. I Kings 14:1-20.

<sup>244</sup>Apart from literature mentioned previously see O.C. Whitehouse, 'Satan' in H.D.B., IV, pp. 407-412; T.H. Gaster 'Satan' in I.D.B. IV, pp. 224-228. The word Σατανᾶς occurs in the following Pauline passages, Rom. 16:20; I Cor. 5:5; 7:5; II Cor. 2:11; 11:14; 12:7; I.2:18; II.2:9; cf. I Tim. 1:20; 5:15. For βελίαρ II Cor. 6:15.

<sup>245</sup>Μετασχηματίσω is used in T.Job VI:4, ὁ Σατανᾶς εἰς ἐκείτην μετασχηματίσθεις, (MS. V has ὁ κονήρος); cf. XXIII:1.

<sup>246</sup>Qumran was familiar with the concept of exclusion from the community, IQS 6:24ff., although if the offence was pardonable the exclusion was only for a determined period. Profanation and words spoken against the community are regarded as mutiny and expulsion is for life, IQS 7:2, 23ff.; cf. IQS. 8:20ff. In IQS 2:4ff. we find a close parallel with I Cor. 5:1ff. The men of Belial are cursed and offered to God so that he will deliver them to the avenging angels, cf. CD 9:1. Presumably there would be an exclusion from the Christian community but no formal excommunication is necessarily implied. 'Delivering to Satan' suggests that they were to be no longer regarded as members. See F. Büchsel, 'καταδίδωμι' in T.D.N.T. II, pp. 169-172, 170. A. Robertson-A. Plummer, The First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, (I.C.C.), Edinburgh, 1914, pp. 99f. refer not only to a solemn expulsion but the culprit being sent back to Satan's domain.

<sup>247</sup>A.C. Thiselton, 'The meaning of Σάρξ in I Cor. 5:5', S.J.Th. 26 (1973), 204-228 has rightly queried the popular interpretation which suggests death or physical suffering. His own suggestion, self-satisfaction (σάρξ, 3:1ff.) must be destroyed, parallels our own in so far as it focusses not on the literal body but evil within.

<sup>248</sup>C.J. Roetzel, Judgement in the Community, is ambivalent between physical death, pp.121, 138, and removing the evil yetzer from man, pp. 123f.



<sup>249</sup> Apart from II.2:9 there are three other possible references to Satan in Thessalonians, I.2:18; 3:5; II.3:3. In the first Satan has the power to frustrate and hinder Paul's missionary activity, cf. Rom. 15:22. The precise meaning is left unanswered by Frame and Rigaux *ad loc.* A similar thought is present in I.3:5  $\mu\eta\ \tau\omega\varsigma\ \epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon$   $\delta\ \kappa\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha\sigma\omega\upsilon$  If  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\omicron\upsilon\nu\eta\rho\omicron\upsilon$  is masculine, II.3:3 (Rigaux; von Dobschütz is uncertain), we have yet another example of Satan's activity against the saints for which they must have the Lord's strength. We must presume the community were instructed about the nature and activity of Satan.

<sup>250</sup> G.B. Caird, The Revelation of St. John the Divine (Bl. N.T.C.), London, 1966, pp. 65ff., is probably correct though. The sea is the reservoir of evil out of which the monster arises and through which redeemed must pass (13:1; 15:2,3).

<sup>251</sup> On the question of the relation of John to the Synoptics see the remarks in the commentaries on John's Gospel. R.E. Brown, The Gospel According to St. John (Anchor Bible, Vol. I), London, 1966, p.XLIV argues for minor cross-influences from the Synoptic tradition during the five stages of redaction in John's Gospel. For an earlier discussion, New Testament Essays, London, 1965, chp. 11. Sanders-Martin, *op. cit.*, deny Mark is a source for the John, but considers the sources of Luke and John overlapped, p.12. R.H. Lightfoot, St. John's Gospel (ed. C.F. Evans), Oxford, 1956 feels John's Gospel interprets the other three, or at least 'the earlier traditions', p.33, and is nearest theologically to Mark, p.34. Lindars, *op. cit.*, pp. 26f. concludes that 'most scholars today favour the view that John made use of independent parallel traditions.' John's sources were at some points identical with, or closely similar to sources, possibly written, used by Mark and Luke. L. Morris, *op. cit.*, pp. 49ff. (see earlier Studies in the Fourth Gospel, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1969, chp. 1) also denies any written dependence but considers that there may have been some relationship on the basis of oral tradition. R. Bultmann, Ev. Johannes, throughout his commentary shows that he believes John used the synoptic tradition, pp. 58, 151 etc. and G.B. Caird, The Gospel of St. Luke (Pelican Gospel Comm.) London, 1963, pp. 20f. views John and Luke relying on two allied streams of oral tradition. Our own position is that whilst written dependence cannot be substantiated, parallel ideas indicate that the sources of the evangelists reach back into earlier traditions of the church.

<sup>252</sup> John, p.363.

<sup>253</sup> C.H. Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, Cambridge, 1963, pp. 26ff., 54.

<sup>254</sup>Ev. Johannes, p.36.

<sup>255</sup>M. Wilcox, 'The Composition of John 13:21-30' in Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in honour of M. Black (ed. E.E. Ellis, M. Wilcox), Edinburgh, 1969, pp. 143ff.

<sup>256</sup>Ibid., p.28.

<sup>257</sup>Conzelmann, Die Apostelgeschichte, p.39.

<sup>258</sup>J.S. Billings, 'Judas Iscariot in the Fourth Gospel', E.T. 51 (1939/40) 156-157. Barrett, John, on 17:12, writes that the author probably saw in Judas the eschatological character (i.e. the Anomos) who must appear before the manifestation of the glory of Christ.

<sup>259</sup>Op. cit., ad loc. For the same use of see I Jn. 2:7b, 24; 3:11; 4:3; Eph. 4:21; I Tim. 4:16.

<sup>260</sup>Giblin, p.62 n.2, has confused the thought of von Dobschütz. The latter mentions Is. 57:4 as a probable background to II.2:3 not Ps. 88 (89):23, p.273. According to him there is no special significance in υἱός which is equivalent to υἱοθεῖα. In which case why did Paul not use the term? 'Son' may give extra emphasis to the genitive of relationship.

<sup>261</sup>R.E. Murphy, 'Šahat in the Qumran Literature', Bib. 39 (1958) 61-66, p.66 n.4 and H. Kosmala op. cit., p.201.

<sup>262</sup>There are other O.T. examples of this type of expression: I Sam. 20:31 'son of death'; II Sam. 7:10 'children of wickedness'; cf. Jub. 10:3 'sons of perdition' (= בְּנֵי חַיָּת), according to Milligan, p.99). In the N.T.: Mt. 23:15 'son of Gehenna', 1.5:5 'sons of light'. On this type of genitive, Moule, p.174; Moulton-Turner, pp. 207f.

<sup>263</sup>Evidence for Greek sources using this type of expression, A. Deissmann, L.A.E., p.165.

<sup>264</sup>The list is enormous, von Dobschütz, Milligan, Frame, W. Neil, L. Morris, Rigaux, Best all ad loc. For the expression in John, Bultmann, Sanders-Mastin, and Bauer; also ad loc.

<sup>265</sup>For the word Bauer, s.v. ἀπώλεια and A. Oepke, 'ἀπώλεια' in T.D.N.T., I, pp. 396-397.

<sup>266</sup>The expression εἰς ἀπώλειαν occurs in Mt. 7:13; Acts 8:20; Rom. 9:22; I Tim. 6:9; Heb. 10:39; Rev. 17:8,11. It is impossible to completely remove from



these occurrences the idea of realm.

267  $\text{ןןןןן}$  . Qere reads  $\text{ןן} - , \text{vel. } \text{ןןן} - ,$

268  $\text{ןןןןן}$  Targ. Job Col. 18 has  $\text{ןןןןן}$ .

269 The author may have borrowed it from any of the references we have given in the texts. He certainly used the book of Job, cf. Rev. 9:6 with Job 3:21; 7:15,16.

270 B.D.B. give it as a proper name = place of destruction.

271 It also signified a realm to Qumran writers.  $\text{ןןןןן}$  3:19 'Thou hast redeemed my soul from the Pit and from the hell of Abaddon' (  $\text{ןןןןן} \text{ } \text{ןןןןן} \text{ } \text{ןןןןן}$  );  $\text{ןןןןן}$  3:32 'Torrents of Belial (a proper name?) shall break into Abaddon' (  $\text{ןןןןן} \text{ } \text{ןןןןן} \text{ } \text{ןןןןן}$  ). This is in parallel with  $\text{ןןןןן}$  . Lohse supplies Abaddon and Sheol to  $\text{ןןןןן}$  3:16 but S. Holm-Nielsen rejects the conjecture and prefers "gates of Sheol" (for the ungodly, not for the release of demons), Hodayot Psalms from Qumran (Acta Theologica Danica, II), Aarhus, 1960, p.59 n.34. The Aramaic form of Abaddon occurs in the Genesis Apocryphon, Col. 12. In it Noah praises the Holy One who rescued them from Abaddon. Cf. J.A. Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I (Biblica et Orientalia, 18), Rome, 1966, p.49, who says that the precise nuance cannot be determined from the broken context, see also  $\text{ןןןןן}$  15:18,  $\text{ןןןןן}$  (text defective). This evidence is very reminiscent of the material found in the O.T.

272 R.P.C. Hanson, 'St. Paul's Quotations of the Book of Job', Theology 53 (1950) 250-253.

273 Cf. I En. 108:11 'generation of light'.

274 Ad loc.

275 Both ad loc. Wohlenberg, p.110 sees the Day as the time of salvation in which Christians share and have a part. Best, ad loc., says the Day retains its eschatological flavour but is passing over into the sense of daylight.

276 p.563.

277 In other words the expression  $\delta \nu\acute{\iota}\delta\varsigma \tau\eta\varsigma$   
 $\alpha\pi\omega\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$  denotes the realm in which the Anomos is to  
 be located. It also refers to his End. The same two  
 thoughts are expressed in I.5:5 : Christians are of (belong  
 to) the realm of light and are destined for it. The author  
 of 1QH 3:24f. expresses similar ideas:

I have stood in the realm of wickedness  
 (  $\eta \psi \chi \eta \lambda \gamma \iota \sigma \mu \acute{o}\varsigma$  ) and my lot  
 was with the damned (  $\lambda \gamma \iota \sigma \mu \acute{o}\varsigma$  )  
 (Vermes)

and 1QH 3:22

Thou has allotted to man an everlasting  
 destiny (  $\epsilon \nu \lambda \omega \gamma \iota \sigma \mu \acute{o}\varsigma$  )  
 (Vermes)

The former idea may have been inspired by Mal. 1:14 where  
 men call Edom the  $\alpha\pi\omega\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$  (LXX  $\delta\rho\iota\alpha$ ).  
 (  $\eta \psi \chi \eta \lambda \gamma \iota \sigma \mu \acute{o}\varsigma$  )

278 Giblin pays no attention to the content of the  
 word but Rigaux thoroughly examines it, pp. 204-206. Cf.  
 the commentaries on II.1:7 (  $\alpha\pi\omega\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\psi\iota\varsigma$  ), Burton,  
op. cit., pp. 433-435; Milligan, Note F, pp. 149-151;  
 Oepke, '  $\alpha\pi\omega\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\pi\tau\omega$  (  $-\psi\iota\varsigma$  )' in T.D.N.T., III,  
 pp. 563-592; H. Schlier, An die Galater, p. 47; B.F. Westcott,  
St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, London, 1906, pp. 178f.

279 See chp. 7, pp. 341f. but cf. Moore, p. 101,  
 who refers it to Christ.

280 Op. cit., pp. 93f.

281 Oepke, '  $\alpha\pi\omega\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\pi\tau\omega$  ', pp. 571ff. shows that  
 when the verb (in the LXX) is related to Yahweh the character  
 and work of God is depicted. At the same time he notes that  
 $\alpha\pi\omega\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\pi\tau\omega$  is found commonly in a literal sense, p. 576.

282 For our purpose it is not necessary to show  
 precisely what is uncovered. Commentators are divided about  
 this and the very original setting of the logia.

283 Cf. too Gospel Thomas, 1:5; P.Oxy. 654.4.

284 D.M. Stanley, op. cit., p. 35 refers I Cor. 4:5  
 back to Mt. 24, no doubt in view of his acceptance of Matthew  
 as the first Gospel. If there is a written basis (although  
 an oral tradition is more probable) Lk. 12:2 is a possible  
 source.

285 The verb also occurs I Cor. 2:4: D has  $\alpha\pi\omega\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\psi\epsilon\iota$   
 (for  $\alpha\pi\omega\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\xi\epsilon\iota$  ) = an open display of the Spirit's work.

286 A.R.C. Leaney, The Gospel According to St. Luke (Bl. N.T.C.), London, 1958, p.70, refers 17:30 to 21:27 = the deliverance of God's people after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Gentiles. The parallel text in Mt. 24:28 (Synoptic Apocalypse) does not have the same meaning he alleges, although originally this material referred to the day of the Son of Man, i.e. one final Day. Of course the destruction of Jerusalem and the final triumph are never distinguished clearly, Caird, Luke, pp. 198-200.

287 C. Bigg, The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude (I.C.C.), Edinburgh, 1901, p.105.

288 K.H. Schelkle, op. cit., ad loc. remarks that we have the objective genitive in 1:8 : Christ is revealed by God before the world. According to Schlier, An die Galater, p.47, we have the same genitive in Gal. 1:12, which together with 1:16; Eph. 3:3,5; Rom. 16:25; (cf. Gal. 3:23), represents Christ as present, an anticipation of the eschatological event. Similarly Rigaux, ad loc. who states that the word finds, "sa dernière et réelle valeur" in eschatology.

289 Instrumental Dative, Bl.-Deb. para. 195 1 (c) citing Mt. 3:12 = Lk. 3:17; Rev. 14:10; cf. H. Lietzmann - W.G. Kümmel, op. cit., ad loc.

290 Associative dative, Bl.-Deb. para. 198; Moulton-Turner, p.252.

291 Cf. von Dobschütz, pp. 245, 271.

292 See too II.1:9.

293 'Εν κυρί φλογός may be connected with δίδόντος ἐκ δίκηςιν, v.8, not ἀποκάλυψις, v.7. For a discussion of this problem, von Dobschütz pp. 246ff. He refers the phrase to both. Rigaux, p.628, disagrees.

294 For an excellent study of this verse, M. Dibelius - H. Conzelmann, Die Pastoralbriefe (H.Z.N.T., 4th edn.), Tübingen, 1966, p.74; idem, An die Philipper, ad loc.

295 Alford, ad loc., has noted this: it means "brought out into the light ... unfolded, displayed".

296 So Schmiedel, p.37.

297 καὶ ἀποκαλύψει κύριος τὸν βραχίονα τὸν ἅγιον αὐτοῦ ἐνώπιον πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν in parallel with καὶ ὀφνύονται πάντα ἄρκα τῆς γῆς τὴν σωτηρίαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν, cf. 53:1 and Oepke, 'ἀποκαλύπτω', pp.571ff.

<sup>298</sup>We agree with Burton, op.cit., p.434 that the verb often conveys the idea of perception, but to find it in every case, as he tries to do, is doubtful. The verb in II.2:3 is in parallel with ἔλθω and implies coming into view. Burton admits that the eschatological use of ἀποκαλύπτω emphasises the objective appearance of a person. So any thought concerning the relevant character of the Anomos in our passage must remain secondary.

<sup>299</sup>For a summary of the views on this chapter, see C. Stuhlmueller 'Zechariah' in J.B.C., p.396.

<sup>300</sup>See Liddell-Scott, s.v. κατορχέομαι.

<sup>301</sup>On the verb ἐκκεντέω, H. Schlier in T.D.N.T., II, pp. 446-447.

<sup>302</sup>The verb ὁράω is used frequently for 'seeing the glory of God', Jn. 11:40; Rev. 22:4 (= Is. 66:18f.); Mt. 5:8; I Jn. 3:2; Bauer s.v.

<sup>303</sup>See Bauer, Johannes, p.221. He also comments that in John εἰς δὲ is connected to ὀφθόντων (not ἐξεκέντησαν as in Justin, Apol. 1:52,11; Dial. 14:8; 32:2 and Schlier, 'ἐκκεντέω', p.447. The subject is already the Jews. We find in Rev. 1:7 and Justin the crucifixion or the piercing of the hands and feet of Jesus are in view not the lance thrust, Bultmann, Ev. Johannes, p.525 n.1.

<sup>304</sup>Words not underlined.

<sup>305</sup>W.H. Simcox, The Revelation of St. John the Divine, Cambridge 1893, p.45 considered these words to be based on Mt. 24:30 as well as 26:64. A.F. Loisy, L'Apocalypse de Jean, Paris, 1923, pp. 72f. alleges that Mt. and Rev. depend on a repertoire of messianic texts exploited according to taste. G.B. Caird, Revelation, p.18, thinks of the two authors drawing on an older tradition of scriptural exegesis. Charles, Revelation, Vol. I, pp. 17ff. argues that the combination of the Zech. and Dan. texts has been achieved in the Jewish-Christian Apocalypse (Mt. 24) and the writer of Revelation knew this. He rejects any idea of a prophetic testimonia and further considers that "the visible and victorious return of Christ with a view to judgment" is found in Rev. 14:14, 18-20; 19:11-21 and probably 20:7-10. If the oral tradition underlying the Synoptic Apocalypse was known by Paul, see the text of chp.6 pp. 200ff. and likewise the combination and use of Zech.12:10 and Dan. 7:13, it is possible that these texts have coloured his view of ἀποκαλύψις. B. Lindars is cautious in his judgement: "If it is right to postulate one common non-Septuagint text underlying the three New Testament allusions, it is bound to raise the possibility of a written Testimony-Book in the early days of the Church". At the very least



there is, he goes on to say, "a living apologetic tradition, oral rather than written", New Testament Apologetic, London, 1961, p.126.

306 Possibly Is. 52:15 has influenced the acceptance of Zech. 12:10 in any messianic testimonia in the early church.  
M.T.  $\text{וְאֵלֶּיךָ יָשׁוּב׃}$   $\text{וְיִשְׁכַּחֲכֶם$   
LXX  $\text{\delta\tau\iota\ \o\iota\varsigma\ \o\upsilon\kappa\ \alpha\nu\eta\gamma\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\ \kappa\epsilon\rho\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\o\omicron\upsilon\ \delta'\psi\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota}$  . In both references a servant of the Lord suffers and the suffering is visible to all. The Is. 52:15 text is taken up by Paul in Rom. 15:21 but given a totally different meaning from its original setting.

307 R.B.Y. Scott has an excellent article on these words, 'Behold he cometh with the clouds', N.T.S. 5 (1958/59) 127-132. He attempts to trace the way the words became associated with the descent of Christ at the End-time (e.g. I.4:17; Mt. 24:30; Rev. 1:7); although he considers Mk. 13:26; 14:62 (and parallels) retain the original sense of coming to God to receive the Kingdom in vindication and triumph.

308 The fact that II.1:7ff. is no more than a collection of O.T. texts (Bornemann, pp. 336ff.; Rigaux, pp. 94f.) may indicate that we are not amiss in seeking an O.T. background to Paul's use of the word  $\alpha\pi\omicron\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\pi\tau\omega$  (-ψις).

309 A circumlocution for God in Mk. 14:62; Mt. 26:64. The phrase itself 'angels of his power' may go back to Dan. 7:10f. cf. T.Jud. 3:10; T.Lev. 18; 4 Ezra 7:28; 13:32; I En. 61:10 = Jude 14.

310 See T.F. Glasson, 'The Ensign of the Son of Man (Mt. 24:30)', J.Th.S. 15 (1964) 299-300.

311 Mk. 14:62, has  $\epsilon\nu\ \nu\epsilon\phi\epsilon\lambda\alpha\iota\varsigma$  ; Lk. 21:27,  $\epsilon\nu\ \nu\epsilon\phi\epsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}$ .

312 So D.E. Nineham, The Gospel of St. Mark (Pelican Gospel Comm., rev. edn.), London, 1968, p.388: an O.T. quotation adapted perhaps from a collection of O.T. texts.

313 In the parallels Mk. 9:1; Lk. 9:27 'the Son of Man' is omitted, but all three Synoptics have 'Kingdom (of God<sup>o</sup> Mk and Lk) which may reflect Dan. 7:13ff. In Mt. 16:27 and parallels the Son of Man (or Kingdom of God) comes  $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\eta\ \delta\omicron\varsigma\eta\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\alpha\tau\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\o\omicron\upsilon\ \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \tau\omega\nu\ \alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omega\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\o\omicron\upsilon$ , cf. II.1:7; Mt. 13:7; 25:31; Zech. 14:5.

314  $\alpha$  omits  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\epsilon\nu\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ .

315 Bicknell, Bornemann, Dibelius, von Dobschütz, Frame, Masson, B. Weiss and others ad loc. consider Paul thought the Anomos existed at the time.

316 Frame, Best ad loc.

317 It is almost impossible to take the article only with ἀντικείμενος. This would make it a substantive, 'the Adversary' (Syriac and I Tim. 5:14, τῷ ἀντικείμενῳ, cf. Zech. 3:1 τοῦ ἀντικείμενου ἀδῶ ) but followed awkwardly by a participle. For the article attached to both, Wohlenberg, von Dobschütz, Frame, Oepke, Masson, against Dibelius, Schlatter and Neil, (Moffatt). If the first is to be regarded as a substantive we should treat it as a descriptive title not a proper name: so Alford, 'The Antichrist' and Staab, 'Der Widersacher', ad loc.

318 Milligan, ad loc. two ptc. clauses.

319 In the LXX (including variants), Ex. 23:22; II Kgdms. 8:10; III Kgdms. 11:14, 25; Esth. 8:11; 9:2; Job 13:25; Zech. 3:1; Is. 41:11; 45:16; 51:19; 66:6; I Mac. 14:7; II Mac. 10:26; III Mac. 7:9.

320 Schmiedel, von Dobschütz, Frame, Best, ad loc.

321 pp. 271ff. There are no examples in Liddell-Scott either, s.v., ἐπί. Probably ἐπί means 'against' in Dan. 11:36, LXX - ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν τῶν θεῶν ἔσθ' ἡ λαλήσει (Theod. reads λαλήσει ὑπὲρ ὅσα καὶ κατενόησεν). Bauer, s.v. ἐπί III.1.a.e cites examples from the Gospels and Acts. Mt. 10:21; 12:26; Mk. 13:8; Lk. 11:17f.; Acts 4:27, but none from the Pauline epistles.

322 This is how it appears to be used in Dan. 11:36 (Theod.). μεγαλυνθήσεται ἐπὶ πάντα θεὸν (LXX ὑψωθήσεται). M.T. גָּדַל - עַל - הַיְיָ הַיְיָ. B.D.B. pp. 757f. note that it means 'against', very often after a verb of attack or implying attack.

323 Ps. 37 (38):4; 71 (72):16 + ὑπὲρ; Prov. 31:29; II Chron. 32:23; Eccles. 48:13; II Mac. 5:23 + Dat.

324 Cf. II Cor. 12:7 where Paul is in danger of becoming proud about his experiences, ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραίρωμαι; see too II Mac. 5:23. For the verb suggesting exaltation to a new status II Chron. 32:23; Ps. 71 (72):16.

325 J.G. Griffiths, '2 Thessalonians 11.4', E.T. 52 (1940/41) 38, although Frame noted the point earlier, p.243. Cf. Moulton-Turner, p.151.

326 Von Dobschütz, Moffatt, Wohlenberg, ad loc.



327Frame, Neil (Moffatt), L. Morris, (Tyndale), and Best, ad loc.

328Neil, (Moffatt), ad loc.

329Chp.6 pp. 164 ff.

330Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. V.25.4 and 30.4; Cyril, Cat. XV:5. Rigaux is attracted to it by reason of the use of ναός and the dependence on Daniel, cf. Mk. 13:14 and Milligan, Bailey.

331On the basis of Markan stories, Gaston, op. cit., pp. 65-102 has argued that the early church was not interested in the temple cult.

332If, as is more than likely, II Cor. 6:16f. refers to the church we have a clear insight into Paul's view of the church; God dwells in (among) his new people - 'the temple of the living God'. Lev. 26:12 is now transferred to the New Israel, cf. Rev. 2:1. E. Best, One Body in Christ, London, 1955, p.168, writes 'God no longer dwells in buildings made with hands nor only in the hearts of his worshippers, but in the whole gathering of his people'. (Eph. 2:21; I Cor. 3:16; II Cor. 6:16).

333On the new covenant, I Cor. 11:25; II Cor. 3:6ff., 14. Pauline arguments against Judaism are found in Rom. 2:17ff. and Gal. 3:1ff. Cf. P. Richardson, Israel in the Apostolic Church (S.N.T.S. 10), Cambridge, 1969, pp. 70-158 and 'La Conception Paulinienne de la Nouvelle Alliance' in Sparsa Collecta: The Collected Essays of W. C. van Unnik, Pt. I (N.T. Suppl., 29), Leiden, 1973, pp. 174-193. The latter pays close attention to the content of the Covenant theme (divine mercy, pardon of sins, renewal in the Spirit) in Paul.

334Giblin, pp. 76-80. Earlier Chrysostom, Theodore, Theodoret.

335In I Cor. 3:16f. the Christian can destroy ( φθειρεῖ ) not merely harm the temple; in 6:19 the temple is apparently a literal σῶμα. II Cor. 6:16 is almost certainly a reference to the community, ἡμεῖς ὑμεῖς ναὸς θεοῦ δοκεῖν σῶματος though the plural does not of itself prove that ναὸς = The Church. R.J. McKelvey, The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament (Oxford Theol. Monographs), Oxford, 1969 has nothing to say on φθειρεῖ, pp. 98-102, and treats 6:19 as 'a particularization of the conception of the church as the temple' p.102. He has no doubt II Cor. 6:16 denotes the church (pp. 93-98). However he does have one reservation. The texts in I Cor. refer primarily to the local church, p.106. C.K. Barrett, I Cor. p.91,

says as it is a local church of which Paul is thinking it can be destroyed. The same identification of Christian community and Temple for I Cor. 3 and II Cor. 6 is found in B. Gärtner, The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament (S.N.T.S., 1), Cambridge, 1965, pp. 49-60. He considers  $\phi\theta\epsilon\iota\omega$  (four times in Paul I Cor. 3:17; 15:33; II Cor. 7:2; 11:3; cf. Eph. 4:22) may reflect  $\text{מִקְדָּשׁ}$  which it often translates, but he takes it in the sense of avoiding the snares of the evil one, p.59. Does this do justice to the verb and secondly does 3:10ff. necessarily speak of building God's Temple = church as McKelvey thinks, p.99?

<sup>336</sup>On Eph. 2:20-22 see McKelvey, op. cit., pp. 108-124 and Gärtner, op. cit., pp. 60-66. The former points out that here (a) the church in its widest sense is in mind and (b) the image is used for doctrinal instruction rather than ethical purposes, p.108. The last point is true of II.2:4 where eschatological instruction is being given. Best, One Body, pp. 166ff. makes the point that in v.20 the building is complete whilst in v.21 it is regarded as growing.

<sup>337</sup>McKelvey traces the thought of a new temple in Jewish literature Is. 2:2ff; Mic. 4:1-3; Ezek. 40-48; Is. 56:7; Tob. 14:5; Ecclus. 36:11-14; Ps.Sol. 17:33f., etc., pp. 9-24. There then developed a tendency to think of the new temple in supernatural terms. Although there are hints of it in the O.T. (e.g. Is. 6:1ff.) the fullest description of a heavenly temple, he says, occurs in the Pseudepigraphical literature, which we have cited in the text of the thesis. Cf. too B. Ta'an 5a; Gen. R. 55:7 and see pp. 25-41. For Qumran material where the New Temple = the community, Gärtner pp. 16-46 esp. p.21, 'The Qumran texts contain eschatological passages which make no mention of the future restoration of the Jerusalem temple, but represent the 'new' temple of the future entirely in 'spiritual' terms, referring to the community and its life according to the Law'. The problem with McKelvey's study is that

- (a) Some texts can hardly be said to denote a future heavenly temple, descending to earth e.g. 1 En. 14:16ff.; 4Q51. They describe the present heavenly one of God.
- (b) The fusion of the Heavenly Temple of Yahweh with the New Temple of ideas (cf. p.90) has not been demonstrated.

The material given needs to be structured to shed light on the idea of a heavenly and new temple. We reject therefore the possible meaning of  $\nu\alpha\omicron\varsigma$  in II.2:4, p.135f., as the New Heavenly Temple in heaven.

<sup>338</sup>Ad loc.

<sup>339</sup>Best, ad loc.

340, Ἀποδείκνυμι in the N.T.: Acts 2:22, 'approved of God' (cf. Jos. Ant. ii.261 'father commended his children'; 25:7, ('could not prove' (i.e. charges); I Cor. 4:9 'God has appointed the apostles ...' (cf. Jos. Ant. vii.65). The verb can take the meaning of show (prove) appoint, commended, and less frequently, proclaim. Best rightly considers the first three to be unacceptable since they indicate success, so we too take it in the sense of proclaim, cf. Dan. 2:48 (LXX); See Lightfoot, p.113, Liddell-Scott, s.v. ἀποδείκνυμι, I.1 and II.1. For the idea, Strack-Billerbeck, III p.640.

341 We probably have the same contrast in Revelation for in chps. 13:1,11 the Beasts arise from the sea and land whereas Christ appears from heaven, 19:11.

342 See D.M. May, Glory at the Right Hand (Soc. Bib. Lit. Mon. 18), New York, 1973, pp. 53-103; a study of Ps. 110:1 in N.T. literature.

343 Bousset, Antichrist, pp. 126, 151f.; Charles, Revelation, II pp. 83ff.; Ernst, pp. 146ff.; cf. Rev. 13:3,14.

344 We have already remarked that ἐσθιν is not merely prophetic (cf. Frame, ad loc.). He objects to taking it to mean 'in process of coming', but if παρουσία means 'presence' ἐσθιν comments not on a process of coming, but on the continued existence of the Anomos.

345 As Frame, ad loc., remarks, logically the advent of the Anomos is for the doomed.

346 Best, ad loc., considers this to be the easiest.

347 With Bornemann, von Dobschütz, ad loc.

348 Moffat, p.49 in his own comments appositively divides vv.9f. in the following way: κατὰ (inspiration), ἐν (method) and results (v.10).

349 Cf. Calvin, ad loc., 'the wicked will be blinded', Frame, 'an energy unto delusion'.

350 τίς is not to be carried on to 'signs and wonders' as Lightfoot, Milligan and others ad loc.. It becomes redundant and as the third phrase, v.10a has καὶ why did Paul not add it 'for signs and wonders' if he intended his readers to understand it in this way?

<sup>351</sup>Staab tries to draw a distinction between 'in jeglicher Macht' and 'Allmacht', p.56. There seems to be little difference in meaning when applied to the verse.

<sup>352</sup>Cf. S.V. McCasland, 'Signs and Wonders', J.B.L. 76 (1957) 149-152. He traces the expressions σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα in the N.T., Jewish Hellenistic writers and the O.T. cf. the possibility of the phrase in 4 Ezra 9:6 'in prodigiis et virtutibus and Box's comment in A.P., II, p.599.

<sup>353</sup>Against Lightfoot, Milligan, Plummer, Frame, Morris (Tyndale) ad loc. To say the δύναμις is false or lying does not make good sense. The use of ψεύδους comments on the concrete tangible evidence of the 'abstract' or intangible power which motivates and empowers the Anomos.

<sup>354</sup>i.e. a genitive of quality, Dibelius, ad loc., not of origin, Frame ad loc.

<sup>355</sup>Adeney; p.241 "real miracles that mislead".

<sup>356</sup>Eadie, p.285.

<sup>357</sup>Morris and Best, ad loc.

<sup>358</sup>Milligan says the verb marks out those who have "already ideally (his italics) reached a state of ἀπώλεια ", p.104.

<sup>359</sup>This is made very clear by the introductory expression, ἀνθ' ὧν : it is very common in the LXX e.g. cf. Amos 5:11, but only occurs in II.2:10 and the writings of Luke (four times).

<sup>360</sup>'love for it', objective genitive. The truth is ultimately Christ, cf. Chrysostom, ad loc.

<sup>361</sup>πιστεύω + Dative elsewhere in Paul only in citations (e.g. Rom. 4:3; 10:16).

<sup>362</sup>Either purpose or result. Whichever is understood the meaning is clear. These apostates have missed salvation.

<sup>363</sup>Cf. the clause δέχεσθαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ which was current in the primitive church, Acts 8:14; 11:1; 17:11; I.1:6; 2:13; I Cor. 2:14; II Cor. 8:17; Gal. 4:14.



364 <sup>Εὐδοκίῳ τῷ</sup> (A); I Mac. 1:43. With <sup>τῷ</sup> <sup>ἐν</sup> see I Cor. 10:5; II Cor. 12:10. 1 Esd. 4:39; Ecclus. 18:31

365 R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institution, (transl. by J. McHugh), London, 1961, pp. 258-267. See IQM passim; I Cor. 15:24-28; Rev. 19:11ff.

366 See chp. 3 on 2:8 for the textual problem.

367 pp. 92ff.

368 E. Pax, ΕΠΙΦΑΝΕΙΑ: Ein religionsgeschichtlicher Beitrag, München, 1955, p.20, cf. pp. 259-261. Abel, op. cit., p.311; L. Cerfaux, op. cit., pp. 34f.; Dibelius-Conzelmann, op. cit., (on II Tim. 1:10), pp. 77f.; J. Dupont, ΣΥΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΩ: L'union avec le Christ suivant Saint Paul, Bruges, 1952, pp. 73-77; Milligan, pp. 148-9; W.M. Ramsay, 'The Greek of the Early Church and the Pagan Ritual', E.T. 10 (1898/99) 208-209, p.208; Rigaux, pp. 201ff.; M. Rostowzen, 'ΕΠΙΦΑΝΕΙΑ', Klio 16 (1920) 203-206, examples of cultic use; P. Wendland, 'ΣΩΤΗΡ: Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung', Z.N.W. 5 (1904) 335-353, pp. 349f. See also, A. Deissmann, L.A.E., p.371 n.1.

369 D. Lührmann, 'Epiphaneia. Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte eines griechischen Wortes' in Tradition und Glaube Festgabe für K. G. Kuhn (ed. G. Jeremias, H.-W. Kuhn and H. Stegemann), Göttingen, 1971, pp. 185-199.

370 Ibid, p.190. See Pax, ibid, pp. 9-13.

371 See Abel's note ibid. p.311 and C.F. Keil, Commentar über Die Bücher der Makkabäer, Leipzig, 1875, p.303.

372 Liddell-Scott, s.v. ἐπιφανεία.

373 Frame and Dibelius, ad loc.

374 Not the coming itself, as Rigaux and Best assert. Paul could have used παρουσία by itself.

375 Bauer, s.v. ἐπιφανεία.

376 So Chrysostom, ἀρκεῖ παρῆναι αὐτόν, (it is sufficient for him to be present).

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### THE KATECHON AND KATECHŌN

In previous chapters our discussion has centred on II.2:1-5, 6b, 8-10, but in moving on to consider the theme of the Katechon we shall consider the rest of the verses in II.2:1-12. In doing so we shall group our comments under the following headings:

- I. Views about the Katechon
- II. The Meaning of the Word
- III. A Theocentric Understanding of the Katechon

#### I. Views about the Katechon

Whatever view is put forward for the nature and function of the Katechon, it will suffer from certain limitations. That should not prevent us from providing a possible and plausible solution and trying to substantiate it as far as we can. Any interpretation must take into account the various restrictions listed below.

- (a) We must choose a fairly common meaning of the word rather than translate from an unusual meaning of the verb.
- (b) We must consider the context of II.2.
- (c) We must present a solution which would have had a relevant meaning to the Thessalonian community.
- (d) We must explain the relationship of the neuter and masculine participles.



(e) We must reconcile an interpretation with the theology of Paul.

Augustine's remark, "Ego prorsus quid dixerit, me fateor ignorare"<sup>1</sup> should not deter us from this daunting task; it has not discouraged many others.

To begin with we shall group the theories under three headings<sup>2</sup>. It is recognised that certain features of some theories could place them in one or more category, but to do that would make the classification over-elaborate. The three groups are:

- A. Contemporary-Political
- B. Contemporary-Religious
- C. Mythical and/or Theological

The first two categories concern theories which find the Katechon to be something or someone present in Paul's day. The last group deals with theories which consider the Katechon to be a force or power outside the natural realm.

#### A. The Contemporary-Political View

This theory supposes that a suitable political figure or power, present in Paul's day, is holding back the revelation of the Anomos. Tertullian in de Res. Carnis c.24 is the first known exponent of this view, though we might well believe that the idea goes back even earlier. He considers the Apostasy is closely related to the Katechon, in that there is a present falling away of the Empire but that at the same time the state is an obstacle to Antichrist. "What obstacle is there but

the Roman State, the falling away of which, by being scattered into ten kingdoms, shall introduce Antichrist?"

There is a need to pray for the stability of the Empire, which alone retards (retardari) all that is to happen<sup>3</sup>.

Although Tertullian does not say so, it would appear that the  $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega\nu$  stands for the Emperor<sup>4</sup>. This view may have been developed from Irenaeus<sup>5</sup>. It is certainly continued in other early writers, Hippolytus<sup>6</sup>, Chrysostom, Jerome, Theophylactus and John of Damascus<sup>7</sup>; Augustine mentions the interpretation<sup>8</sup>. We should note the association of the fall of the Empire (the fourth Danielic Empire, Dan. 7) with the emergence of Antichrist whilst Tertullian<sup>9</sup> prays for its disappearance to be delayed, Jerome<sup>10</sup> merely records that it is to be destroyed and ventures no further comment, cf. 4 Ezra 5:3; II Bar. 39:7.

This view was followed by many scholars at the turn of this century, notably Bousset<sup>11</sup>, Charles<sup>12</sup>, Askwith<sup>13</sup>, Denny<sup>14</sup>, Bornemann<sup>15</sup>, von Döbschutz<sup>16</sup>, J. Moffatt<sup>17</sup> and it has been revived recently by Oepke<sup>18</sup>, Whiteley<sup>19</sup> and Richards<sup>20</sup>. Whiteley tries to ally this view with mythology. Perhaps, he says, Paul has resorted to "Historisierung" in II, in that history has been described in mythological terms: in reality, he surmises, the Roman Empire is being described. Oepke expresses the same thoughts.

Akin to this view of the Roman Empire is that which considers we have an indirect reference to the Empire. Lightfoot<sup>21</sup> argues that the restraining power is, perhaps, a principle of law, order or civil government of which the Roman Empire was a type.  $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega\nu$  is a personification of this. Milligan<sup>22</sup> and Morris<sup>23</sup> follow the suggestion but

Orchard's<sup>24</sup> independent view sees the neuter as the unfulfilled event of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans and, inconsistently, the masculine as a reference to the archangel Michael.

Finally two recent views should be placed in this group. Betz<sup>25</sup> argues that the Katechon is not an ad hoc idea. From a detailed study of IQ27, in which he finds parallels with II, he attempts to show the source of Paul's thought. He also sees parallels in the  $\Pi^{\prime}\Psi\Omega$  of Dan. 9:25, and in Cyrus, Is. 45:1, who hold back evil. He therefore proposes that Paul has in mind a similar person, probably the Emperor Claudius. D.W.B. Robinson<sup>26</sup> has a very different approach to the problem. He rejects  $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega$  = restrain and translates instead 'hold sway', so 'occupy' or 'possess'. Hence in II.2 we have a title for the occupying or possessing power which in his opinion is Rome.

#### Comments Upon Contemporary-Political Theories

1. From the standpoint of the present day the Roman Empire has vanished and Antichrist has not appeared. Paul made a mistake. This of course does not invalidate these views. On the contrary many scholars would associate this with the failure of Paul's expectation of an imminent Parousia in which he hoped to share, cf. I.4:15.
2. Frame<sup>27</sup> has made two points about the view, and we can link them together. Nowhere else in Paul's writings is the Roman Empire viewed as a restrainer. He may have had a high regard for its authority and institutions (cf. Rom. 13) but it

is not described as a force which holds back Antichrist. It is possible that Paul (or earlier tradition) formed this opinion and then, so far as we know, did not use it again. The other point Frame makes is that the theory has the merit of providing a reason for the use of veiled language. As Augustine and Chrysostom have stated, Paul had no wish to offend Roman authorities<sup>28</sup>.

3. The basic objection to the view, other than on linguistic grounds, is that a historical-political reference is introduced which does not seem warranted by the passage. The emphasis is very much on forces which are spiritually orientated and yet to be disclosed. In an apocalyptic book, such as Daniel, no human Empire carries out the function ascribed to the Roman or any other state. Of course if we translate κατέχω 'hold sway' the objection is less valid because the emphasis falls on the continuity of state, not its moral, social or political restraint.

4. Apart from Robinson, those who share this approach to the problem have the following points in common.

- (a) The verb is taken in the sense of 'prevent', 'keep back', 'detain' or 'be an obstacle to'.
- (b) The Katechon is considered to be a good force, or at least beneficial.
- (c) The mystery of lawlessness is understood as a reference to evil at work inside the state (Nero may be a precursor<sup>29</sup>). From it Antichrist will arise.

- (d) The Greek phrase, ἐκ πέσου γένηται,  
means 'be removed' or 'disappear'.

#### B. The Contemporary-Religious View

Some very interesting and important contributions have been in this group. In 1921, Hartl<sup>30</sup> took II.2:3,4 as the main spring of Paul's thought and in particular the enthronement of Antichrist in the temple of God. What prevents this, he suggested, was the present temple cult, in which synagogue and church have a part. Katechōn is a personality which plays a role in the Katechon but Hartl is reluctant to go beyond this, and is content to equate the neuter with τὸ ἱερόν and the masculine with ὁ ναός.

Buzy<sup>31</sup> understood the Man of Lawlessness figure to be a collective term. This left him with the problem of deciding what hindered those Anomoi, who are not necessarily possessed of eschatological significance<sup>32</sup>. On the basis of what he calls 'obstacles' (Mt. 24:14; cf. 10:5-7, 16-20, 26-27; Rev. 11:3ff.) he considered the obstacle to be the "la prédication de l'Évangile par les apôtres, prophètes, missionnaires ou témoins"<sup>33</sup>. His view is to be rejected for the following reasons.

i. Antichrist, or to be accurate, the Anomos is an individual eschatological figure, rather than a number of individuals.

ii. Buzy has to plead a distinction between ordinary Antichrists and those who happen to be at the End-time, since they will appear after the obstacle has been removed.

iii. The distinction between masculine and neuter is not made clear.

iv. The whole passage, in our opinion, is eschatological.

Cullmann has produced one of the most plausible schemes of recent times<sup>34</sup>. Attaching the  $\sqrt{\text{O}}\sqrt{\text{V}}$  of v.6 to  $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon'\chi\omicron\upsilon\upsilon$  and taking the verb in the sense of 'retarder' (delay), he argues that a new messianic sign is being given to the Thessalonians. This has its origins in Rabbinic thought. In the Talmud the question is asked,  $\text{כִּי בִּימֵינוּ יֵשֶׁנָּה הַמָּסָחָר}$ . This arose because the End did not materialise and an explanation had to be found. One such explanation was that Israel had not repented<sup>35</sup>. In Cullmann's view this notion of national repentance, coupled with the return of Elijah to give an eschatological call to show true contrition<sup>36</sup>, is the antecedent of Christian thought. In the N.T. there are a series of texts in which the thought of preaching, judgment and the End are brought together<sup>37</sup>. From this he concludes that preaching, as a sign of the Messianic era, takes a new turn in Paul to the extent that in Rom. 9-11, Paul himself, the Apostle to the Gentiles (Gal. 1:15; Rom. 1:5) becomes the one who carries out the role of the  $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon'\chi\omega\upsilon$ . The preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles is the present delay ( $\tau\omicron \kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon'\chi\omicron\upsilon\upsilon$ ) before the End-time events.

Munck<sup>38</sup> follows Cullman's scheme, but seeks to stress more fully the connection between Paul's apostolic ministry to the Gentiles and his eschatological task. He writes, "the apostolic consciousness reaches a greater intensity than in the case of any other apostle or any other O.T. prophet.



In a way he is called upon to play the part of prophetic herald in the sense of Jewish apocalyptic thought"<sup>39</sup>.

However no extra evidence is given by Munck. Moore<sup>40</sup> also accepts the basic idea of the theory without specifying the  $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega\nu$  as Paul, and Evans<sup>41</sup> is attracted by the view.

#### Comments Upon Cullmann's View

1. Paul has become, in effect, Elijah, forerunner of Messiah. But the Katechon is prior to the Anomos, not Messiah.

2. It is special pleading to say that Paul had this consciousness of his eschatological role to the Gentiles. Apart from II.2:6f. no other evidence is forthcoming<sup>42</sup>.

3. We must question very seriously his understanding of the verb  $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega$  in the sense of delay. We would have expected  $\chi\rho\omicron\nu\acute{\iota}\varsigma\omega$  <sup>43</sup>.

4. If Paul talks of 'disappearing', what of his hope to be present at the Parousia? Cullmann cites Phil. 1:23 for the thought of Paul's death, but this text appears in later letter<sup>44</sup>.

5. Why did Paul talk so cryptically about his work? Surely he would have explained his role before the End in clear and unmistakable terms.

6. Paul is not talking about the delay of Christ or the End in II.2 but why the Day has not yet come.<sup>45</sup>

Most recently GIBLIN has produced a very thorough monograph on the whole subject. He takes as his point of departure the meaning 'seize' or 'take hold of' for  $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega$ . The verb conveys something and someone hostile to the community and God<sup>46</sup>. At present the community are experiencing ( $\omicron\upsilon\delta\alpha\tau\epsilon$  <sup>47</sup>) this force and person, which is stigmatised by the use of  $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega$  as "a Dionysiac, demonic, viz., pseudo-prophetic force"<sup>48</sup>. This present threat, otherwise undefined, is linked intimately with the future manifestation of "the archetypal anti-faith figure", or again, the present threat is "ordered to the future climatic manifestation of the latter, the false prophet par excellence"<sup>49</sup>. So v.6a and 7 refer to the present and v.6b and 8 to the future Rebel<sup>50</sup>. GIBLIN has made detailed stylistic, grammatical and word studies to support his theory. The simplest way of following his view, is to quote his translation:

And now you know by experience the seizing power for his being manifested at his own (proper) time. For the mystery of rebellion is already at work, but the Seizer (is to be, is to seize) for the present until he is ousted. And then will the Rebel be manifested<sup>51</sup>.

#### Comments Upon GIBLIN's View

1. Although GIBLIN translates  $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega$  'seize' he wants to understand the word in the sense of 'possessed' and he admits it is unusual for the active of the verb to have this meaning<sup>52</sup>.

2. Ἐκ πέσου γένηται does not warrant the translation of 'ousted'.

3. The relationship between v.6a and 6b is very obscure. It does not seem clear or logical. Εἰς τὸ is not given a final force, and if treated as introducing a result it makes little sense, especially as he agrees that the Katechon of v.6a is distinct from the reference to the Rebel in 6b. He tries hard to maintain that there is an "ontological relationship" between these two parts of v.6. (as well as v.7c and 8)<sup>53</sup>. On his theory there are two evil forces in view, but it is not adequate to link them without a basis in the text. It would be easier to say, 'when one thing goes (i.e. the Katechon) the other is revealed (i.e. the Rebel)'.

4. With the relationship of v.7c and 8 he has the same problem. He talks about an "ontological relationship" because he does not wish to give the καὶ ὡς temporal force. Citing texts with καὶ ὡς in eschatological contexts<sup>54</sup> and inferring they mean "decisive moments" will not do. All the texts he mentions show temporal force, and since our passage is littered with temporal verbs and terms we cannot evade this sense.

All the theories we have considered in this section have a number of objections which render them doubtful, however plausible they appear at first. We shall move on then to look at the final and larger group of mythical and/or theological solutions.

### C. Mythological and/or Theological View

In this category we place theories which do not look for historical solutions but seek instead answers from a consideration of myth, prophecy, apocalypticism and 'Old Synagogue' traditions. Against this background is viewed Paul's description of the Katechon. We can group the theories into three divisions but inevitably there will be some overlapping of ideas.

1. Mythical Origins
2. The Will of God
3. Hostile Forces.

#### 1. Mythical Origins

Gunkel<sup>55</sup> suggested that the idea of a restrainer really lies in past myths which refer to evil powers, already in existence, but held back. Of course, Paul is not thinking of some nebulous power implied by a particular myth but something more concrete as the Restrainer, for instance Elijah. Dibelius<sup>56</sup> developed this idea with greater clarity. Using O.T. texts, (Amos 9:3; Is. 30:7; Job 40:26ff.; Ps. 104:26; cf. I En. 60:24; 4 Ezra 6:51ff.; II Bar. 29:4) he asserts that the milieu from which Paul's thought arises is that of the chaos monster in chains until the End. Antichrist, a false Jewish Messiah, is already in existence but held fast. We cannot guess who holds him and the change from neuter to masculine is unimportant as it shows, perhaps, the uncertainty in Paul's mind. We must make the comment that the O.T. texts given by Dibelius do not yield a very clear picture of

monsters in chains awaiting release for a final evil onslaught and better evidence would appear to be required.

However W. Neil<sup>57</sup> has found Dibelius' views attractive and he largely follows his scheme. The only real difference is that Neil suggests it could be Michael or Elijah who is the means by which evil is held in check. Even Cullmann, in developing his own view, thought that mythological ideas underlie II.2 and both Oepke and Whiteley share the same feeling even if they consider such thoughts crystallize into a political reference in our passage<sup>58</sup>. It may well be that mythical traits do underlie Paul's thought, but how definitely they shaped his Katechon, it is impossible to say. The idea of God keeping evil in control and then allowing it to flourish is, we consider, the background to our passage but texts such as Amos 9:3 seem to stress God punishing sin, not holding back the Serpent, which is also the implication of II.2:11: God sending The Lie. One final comment must be made. Whatever the origins of the Katechon for Paul, it must have been a concrete and readily understandable idea to the Thessalonians. We are right to consider what it meant to Paul in relation to the O.T., extra-biblical literature and early church tradition, but we must bear in mind what it meant to the readers.

## 2. The Will of God

Chrysostom mentions but rejects the view that the Katechon is the grace of the Holy Spirit<sup>59</sup>. He does so on the grounds that Paul would have written that, or its equivalent

τὰ χαρίσματα

. These gifts, he writes, have ceased

so by now Antichrist should have come. Theodore and Theodoret also realised how untenable this was and they have commented accordingly. Theodore writes, τούτο κατέχον ὁ Ἀπόστολος ὀνομάσει τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν ὄρον, ὅθεν καὶ ἐπήγγεν, εἰς τὸ ἀποκαλυφθῆναι αὐτὸν τῷ ἑαυτοῦ καιρῷ.

Theodoret explains further, ἐδοκίμασε γὰρ ὁ τῶν ὄλων Θεὸς παρὰ τὸν τῆς συντελείας αὐτὸν ὀφθῆναι καιρόν. Ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοίνυν αὐτὸν ὄρος νῦν ἐπέχει φκνήναι.

It is interesting to note Theodoret's use of ἐπέχω for κατέχω, which he understood in the sense of 'restrain'. The divine plan suggested is nothing vague but that revealed in Mt. 24:14 and Mk. 13:10. In his comments upon II.2:7 he writes, Δεῖ δὲ παύσασθαι, τῆς δεισιδαιμονίας τὴν πλάνην, καὶ κηρυχθῆναι τ. εὐαγγέλιον. Whilst the logic of his view (and Theodore's too) points to God being the Katechon, neither church commentator makes the equation. In any case their criticism of the argument that the Katechon referred to the Holy Spirit (it was impossible for the grace of the Spirit to cease entirely: χάρις τοῦ Πνεύματος ) would also apply to their own view.

The 'solution' that Katechon is the will of God was taken up in 1913 by Burg<sup>60</sup>. However he supplied no new material or sustained arguments, but much more recently in 1961, the theory has found fresh support in the work of Strobel<sup>61</sup>. He has much in common with Cullmann in that he



argues we must exegete II.2 from well-known traditions, and in particular Hab. 2:3.

כִּי עוֹד יִהְיֶה מִלְחָמָה וְלֹא יִכְזָּב אֲמַרְתָּ  
יְהוָה לֹא כִּי בָּא גִבּוֹר לְאִתָּהּ

διότι ἔτι ὄρασις εἰς καιρὸν καὶ ἀνατελεῖ εἰς πέρας  
καὶ οὐκ εἰς κενόν· ἐὰν ὑστερήσῃ, ὑπόρκειν αὐτόν,  
ὅτι ἐρχόμενος ἥξει καὶ οὐ μὴ χρονίσῃ.

The following points will attempt to clarify his view.

(a) He tries to establish the widespread knowledge of the delay motif (Hab. 2:3) in Jewish-Hebrew witnesses, citing as examples IQpHab; IQM 27; Sanh. 97b; Targ. Hab. 2:3; Targ. Is. 46:13; 4 Ezra 4:33f.; 5:44f. The delay motif is also present in Dan. 9:19, the interpolation of Hab. 2:3 in the text of Is. 13:22; 51:14 and Pseudo Philo 51:5. In the N.T. we find Hab. 2:3 quoted in Heb. 10:35ff. and II Pet. 3:8f. and dealt with in one way or another in I Clement, Justin Martyr, Aristides, II Clement, Hermes and Tertullian. Much of the material which he uses is late (i.e. post II) and what little evidence there is makes us treat with caution the idea of a well-known tradition at the time of Paul<sup>62</sup>.

(b) He equates קָטַח Pi. with κατέχω citing Gen. 24:56, since the Hebrew קָטַח is translated by κατέχετε. It is interesting to compare Cullmann's equation: עָכַב (the Talmud) = κατέχω = קָטַח (Job 37:4).

(c) In Hab. 2:3, as in II.2, the appointed time is due to God alone. In his estimation v.7 is parallel to v.6 and reflects the O.T. thought. V.6, God's will permits the revelation of Antichrist and v.7, God, himself, allows Antichrist to emerge.<sup>63</sup> So he attributes to Paul the use of the theocentric traditional Hab. 2:3 idea and draws a parallel between ἐν τῷ καιρῷ and the Hebrew, 79707. God is the Katechōn of times and seasons, I.5:1.

(d) He refers the ἐκ πέρου γέν. . . v.7, to Antichrist and translates "bis es (endgültig) beseitigt wird"<sup>64</sup>. The es refers both to the Anomos and the Secret of Lawlessness and the beseitigt has nothing to do with manner; it is either the equivalent of 7170 or a Latinism, e medio tollere.

We consider that Strobel has pointed in the right direction for a solution to the riddle i.e. one that is theocentric, but he has created problems which Ernst, closely following him, has made no attempt to answer<sup>65</sup>. The following comments will highlight these problems.

1. Our passage has nothing to do with delay. We made the same criticism of Cullmann's theory. Paul is not saying, "You know what delays the Parousia"<sup>66</sup>.
2. Κατέχω cannot be equated with χρονίζω, and his reference to Gen. 24:56 is inappropriate as it is best to translate there, "Hinder, or detain me not ...".
3. In Hab. 2:3 the verse deals with a Delay of a particular 'End', whereas in II.2 the delay (if we accept his view) is of

Antichrist. The two texts are not parallel. If Hab. 2:3 is to be a base for II.2 we have to argue that the O.T. text has been adapted and modified, which is not impossible, but it requires proof.

4. Strobel has not proved a well-known tradition by quoting some texts, many of which can be considered later than II.2, and others which are doubtful for such a view e.g. Dan. 9:19.

5. It is difficult to treat ἐκ πέσου γέν. , v.7, as Strobel suggests because

- (i) it is hard not to translate 'be removed' or even 'eliminated'.
- (ii) we have a difficult change of subject from 7b to 7c; one refers to God, the other to Antichrist.

If we are going to succeed with a theocentric solution we must look for texts which speak not of delay but of God holding on to evil and then allowing it to flourish for a time, cf. Rev. 20:3.

### 3. Hostile Forces

The views which we are going to look at now, find their answer in treating the Katechon as something hostile or an evil obstacle to the coming of Christ. We may start with Schäfer<sup>67</sup>, 1890, who indicated that it was possible to take κατέχω intransitively and in the sense of 'rule' or 'hold sway', (herrschen). According to this scholar, the neuter referred to the mystery of lawlessness, αὐτοῦ of

v.6 to Christ and the masculine, v.7 to Satan. Frame<sup>68</sup>, 1912, modified this scheme by agreeing that Satan is the person in view in this passage but treating the masculine as a reference to Satan as "the god of this age" the temporary ruler, ὁ κατ. ἄρτου cf. Eph. 2:2 and the neuter as "the evil spirit" who works in the sons of disobedience. The Apostasy and Anomos only appear when Satan's time is up and he is out of the way, (cf. possibly, he suggests, Rev. 12:7ff.). The weaknesses of this view are, Satan seems to be very active during Antichrist's time v.9ff., and the use of κατέχω in the sense of 'rule' is doubtful.

Freese<sup>69</sup>, 1921, like Schäfer considered the delay of Christ is the point of the passage. The Katechon is something which delays it, so the neuter refers to the Apostasy and the masculine to the Man of Lawlessness. The first is present, but the second has yet to occur. Apart from many criticisms which can be made of grammatical points, the major objection is the importation of the delay of Christ into the passage.

Schmid<sup>70</sup>, 1949, took issue with Buzy over the collective interpretation of Antichrist. He emphasized the uniqueness of this figure. The Anomos is also the Katechōn, whilst the neuter stands for the mystery of lawlessness which precedes the Anomos = αὐτόν , v.6. Knox<sup>71</sup> 1952, suggested we have here an obstacle to Christ's coming. The neuter refers to the incredulity of the Jews and the masculine stands for Satan. Coppens<sup>72</sup>, 1960, touches briefly on the Katechon, but in doing so expresses his own solution: the masculine refers to the Man of Lawlessness and the neuter to the Apostasy.

An important piece of argument comes from Andriessen<sup>73</sup>, 1960. Adopting the delay-of-Christ approach, he believes that v.6 refers to the Apostasy which precedes, accompanies and follows Antichrist's manifestation<sup>74</sup>. V.7 refers to the Anomos himself. Agreeing with Freese that ἐκ πέσου γέν. means appear (but for different reasons) he proceeds as follows. 'You know what retains Christ, in order that Christ will be revealed in his own time; it is the Apostasy, past, present and future, the mystery of Lawlessness which is already at work. Only there is one who retains (retient) at present until he appears and separates from the Just'. In other words ἐκ πέσου γέν. is really The Apostasy. Our comments on his theory are as follows.

1. Although he uses the word retain (retenir), it is most inappropriate as he is using it to convey the idea of delay. It would be better to use retarder, but we have already pointed out that the question is not, 'What delays Christ from appearing?'
2. He tries to extract too much out of ἐκ πέσου γένηται. It does not mean disappear to re-appear or separate, cf. Mt. 13:49.
3. Most serious of all the functions of masculine and neuter do not seem to be clearly related. The Apostasy is an on-going affair, the Anomos is one definite figure in the future and the two ideas do not fit Cullmann's rule<sup>75</sup>.
4. He has to supply an αὐτοῦ to v.6a, to make sense of

6b. We should note however that Katechon is treated as a noun, and does not require an object.

Another closely argued theory was published a year later. In it Sirard<sup>76</sup> paid very careful attention to the structure and vocabulary of the passage. His main points were:

(a) κατέχω has a basic sense of "tenir auprès de soi", which he says can be used in the sense of 'hold captive', Rom. 7:6. This must not be watered down to, 'to be an obstacle to', 'restrain' or 'κωλύω = tenir à l'écart'. The verb can also mean "tenir sous sa domination", which he accepts for II.2 and argues, is the ordinary sense of κατέχω (he cites Schäfer: dominer).

(b) Τὸ κατέχον is the general effect of evil forces, and is equivalent to Satan's mystery of lawlessness, cf. II Tim. 3:13; I Jn. 2:18-22; Mt. 24:12-24; Jms. 4:4; Gal. 1:4. The neuter is due in fact to the neuter μυστήριον. 'Ὁ κατέχων is apparently the Anomos. He is not very clear at times. It is possibly Satan, since he says that the true sign of the End must be the fall of the kingdom of Satan, cf. Schäfer and Frame. So the Day of the Lord has not come because Satan's kingdom has not yet fallen.

(c) He explores the meaning of ἀποκαλύπτω and translates it 'taken in judgment', v.3,6,8. The ἐκ μέσου γένηται, v.7, refers to the same event.



(d) There are some small but important points, where he differs from other scholars. In v.6, εἰς is taken in the sense of until, (= ἕως), because of the meaning he gives to ἀποκαλύπτω; see point c. Γάρ in v.7 stands as 'to explain further'. Sirard wants a very close connection between verses 6 and 7. Μόνον is attached to ὁ κατέχων ἄρτι and translated, 'he is the Katechōn of the moment'. Finally in vv.8,9 he reads, 'The Lord will nullify the appearing of the presence of Anomos, whose (i.e. the Anomos) presence is due to ...'. Ἐπιφάνεια in the accusative is read by a few witnesses and Sirard considers their reading to be original<sup>77</sup>.

#### Comments Upon Sirard's Solution

1. It is doubtful if κατέχω can be translated 'exercise l'emprise'.
2. The link between 6a and 6b is only possible by translating εἰς τό 'until' which is very unlikely.
3. The relationship of the personal and impersonal functions of κατέχων (-ων) is not at all clear.
4. Ἀποκαλύπτω can only be taken as Sirard suggests if the context dictates. II.2:1ff does not indicate this. Moreover we have argued earlier that the real meaning of the verb is 'public disclosure' and the context admirably suits this.
5. If a theory depends on minor textual support, as for ἐπιφάνεια, then it is most unsatisfactory.

6. Ἀποκαλυφθῆναι does not appear to refer to the same event as ἐκ πέσου γένηται.

Finally Best<sup>78</sup>, 1972, has added his own understanding of the problem. He considers that the verb may take the meaning 'occupier' or 'possessor'. What occupies is something hostile, in fact the force of evil (neuter) whilst the κατέχων stands for some person, who is human or supernatural. Criticism made of similar views, also applies here. The transition from 6a to 6b is not clear and we question the meaning of occupying in the sense of 'holding sway' or 'ruling'.

We have surveyed various theories not only because they have not been grouped and criticised in this way before, but because it is useful to draw conclusions about the group as a whole. It will help to focus attention on the problems to be avoided or answered.

#### General Comments on all Theories of the Katechon

(i) The verb has been taken in what we may call, for want of a better description, a negative and positive sense. In a negative sense the meaning is, detain, restrain, hold back, prevent, hinder or be an obstacle to. In a positive sense the meaning is, hold fast, hold sway, occupy, rule, seize.

(ii) The delay of Christ is indirectly present whatever meaning we give κατέχω. However if the αὐτόν, v.6b, refers to Christ, or the verb is understood as 'delay'

then it is directly implied. If the delay of the Parousia is in view, ἀποκαλύπτω has to be given the sense of 'taken in judgment' or the uncovering of the real nature of a person i.e. the Anomos.

(iii) If our passage is discussing the delay of Christ, we appear to have a change of argument. In vv.2-4 Paul is saying the Day of the Lord cannot have come because two things must happen first, whilst in vv.6ff. he is saying you know why there is a delay in the coming of Christ. There are two different questions being answered. Paul however appears to be answering the question 'Why is the Day of the Lord not present?' not 'Why is the Parousia of Christ delayed?' throughout the entire passage.

(iv) Theological theories do have the advantage of fitting in with a passage which is very much oriented to this type of thought, cf. II.2:9-12 particularly.

(v) Suggestions have been made that we understand ἐκ πέσου γένηται other than in the sense e medio tollere.

(vi) Theories which take  $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon'\chi\omega$  in a 'positive' sense, have greater difficulty in maintaining a smooth progression of argument from vv.3,4 to vv.6ff. This can be seen more clearly if we set out the negative and positive sense of the verb.

Negative: First must come the Apostasy and the Man of Lawlessness be revealed, who will ... You recall these things, ... and now you know that which prevents, restrains etc., him and hence the Day coming.

Positive: First must come the Apostasy and the M. of L. be revealed, who will ... You recall these things ... , and now you know what seizes (Seizing force), occupies (Occupying force), holds sway, rules, in order that, (so that, until) he (Christ or the Anomos is revealed (or taken in judgment)).

The positive has the apparent advantage of having an intransitive and absolute sense for masculine and neuter. Even so the question remains, 'occupies (seizes, holds sway over, rules) what?' The negative really requires an object and fails to treat the verb as a substantive.

In view of the recent attempt to provide  $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon'\chi\omega$  with a positive sense in II.2 we must now proceed to take a careful look at the verb and its possible translation.

## II. The Meaning of κατέχω 79

In view of the different ways of translating the verb, we must make a careful assessment of its use in biblical and non-biblical texts. At the same time we must remember that the context which best suits one of the possibilities is more likely to provide the correct solution.

### A. LXX Usage

The word occurs forty six times in the LXX (excluding apocryphal books). Griblin notes, in connection with his own translation of it, that it is often used for ἑλκεῖν, 'grasp'; 'take hold of'<sup>80</sup>. We shall look at each of these references in turn. All are in the Qal except for Gen. 22:13, Niphal.

### 'Negative' Sense

II Kgdms. 6:6. The first time it is used it comes to mean 'prevent' because of the following ἐκράτησεν. Uzzah 'stretched out his hand to the ark to prevent it (i.e. from falling, κατέχεῖν ) and he seized it'. See too I Chron. 13:9. Gen. 22:13, Niphal 'a ram caught in a thicket', ( κατέχομενος ). Job 23:9 (Negative sense?) 'On his left hand, when he works, then I do not have him', (οὐ κατέχομαι ).

### 'Positive' Sense

II Kgdms. 1:9; 2:21; 4:10. 'took hold of', so 'seized' to fight.

III Kgdms. 1:21. 'took hold of the altar'.

Ps. 118 (9) :53. 'Horror has taken hold of me'.

Ps. 138 (9):10. 'Thy right hand takes hold of me'.

Cant. 3:8. 'All taking hold of swords'.

Jer. 13:21. 'Shall not trouble take hold of you?'

Where there is a reference to 'taking hold of' reference is to the act first of all, not the possession.

We can have a look next at translation of  $\rho\tau\eta$   
'be, grow firm or strong, strengthen', by  $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega$   
All cases are in the Hiphil except for IV Kgdms. 12:13 (12)  
(Piel).

Judges 19:4, B text. 'And his father-in-law detained him'. (N)

Jer. 6:24. The same meaning as 13:21. (P)

III Kgdms. 2:28 Joab 'took hold of the altar horns' (P)

Neh. 3:4 (tris.), and IV Kgdms. 12:13 (12) have a special use of the verb. It comes to mean 'repair'.

In all other cases of the Greek verb we find it is used to translate different Hebrew words, never more than twice.

Gen. 24:56 (  $\gamma\tau\lambda$  = delay, tarry). 'Hinder me not' (  $\mu\lambda$   
 $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\tau\epsilon$  ) (N)

Gen. 39:20 (  $\gamma\sigma\lambda$  Qal. = imprison, bind). 'Prisoners were bound there'. (N)

Gen. 42:19 (  $\gamma\sigma\lambda$  Niphal) 'Let one of the brethren be bound, retained'. (N)

Ex. 32:13 (  $\lambda\tau\eta$  = get or take as a possession). 'possess land'. (P)

Jos. 1:11 (  $\omega\gamma$  = inherit). 'Take hold of the land'. (P)



Judg. 13:15,16, B text (  $\text{רָצַו}$  = restrain, retain). 'Let us detain you' ... 'If you detain me'. (N)

Ruth 1:13 (  $\text{רָצַו}$  Niphal = shut oneself in or off). 'Do not refrain from marriage (  $\text{κατασχεθήσεσθε}$  )'. (N)

II Chron. 15:8 (  $\text{רָצַו}$  = seize, capture). 'Jeroboam possessed abominations'. (P).

Job 34:14 (  $\text{רָצַו}$  = gather, remove). 'Restrain his spirit in him'. (N)

Prov. 19:15 (  $\text{לִפְּנֵי}$  (?) = fall, lie). 'Cowardice keeps down (or possesses) the effeminate man'. (N?)

Is. 40:22 (  $\text{יָשָׁב}$  = sit, remain, dwell). '  $\text{ὁ κατέχων τὸν γῶπον τῆς γῆς}$  = limits or restrains? (N?)

Ps. 68 (9):36 (  $\text{לִפְּנֵי}$  = as Ex. 32:13). (P)

Ps. 72 (3):12 (  $\text{הִגְדִּיל}$  Hiph. = grow, increase). 'Sinners possessed wealth'. (P)

Job 15:24 (  $\text{רָצַו}$  = prevail over). 'Distress takes hold of him'. (P)

Job 27:17 (  $\text{רָצַו}$  = share, divide). 'True ones possess'. (P)

Jer. 27 (50):16 (  $\text{וַיִּשָּׂא}$  = lay hold of, wield). 'The one who holds a sickle in the time of harvest'. (P)

Ezek. 33:24 (  $\text{וַיִּשָּׂא}$  = as Jos. 1:11). 'Abraham possessed the land'. (P)

Dan. 7:18, LXX & Theod. (  $\text{רָצַו}$  = take possession of). 'Saints shall possess the kingdom'. (P)

Dan. 7:22, LXX & Theod. (  $\text{רָצַו}$  = as Dan. 7:18). 'Saints possessed it'.

No doubt translators of different sections of the LXX used κατέχω in their own particular way and with freedom. In spite of its use to translate varied Hebrew words it seems to have a basic meaning of 'take hold of', whether in a negative or positive sense. The rest of the texts given below have no Hebrew word underlying them.

On the positive side we find

III Kgdms. 2:29, 'take hold of the altar'.

Jüdth. 5:19, 'God's people, regathered, have possessed Jerusalem'.

Ecclus. 46:9, 'possessed an inheritance'.

Jer. 37 (30):6, 'hold on to loins'.

On the negative side,

Tob. 10:2, Tobit asked, 'Are they detained?'.

I Mac. 6:27, 'you will not be able to restrain them', i.e. rebellious Jews; possibly 'rule them'.

II Mac. 15:5, 'he did not restrain (sic. himself) to carry out his cruel will'.

III Mac. 5:12, 'he was held fast, by the working of the Lord'.

Two texts are debatable;

Prov. 18:22, 'he who keeps, (ὁ δὲ κατέχων) an adulteress is foolish and ungodly'.

Wis. 17:4, Neither the corner keeping them, guarded them from fear ...

II Kgdms. 6:6 has an unnecessary τοῦ κατεχέντος added to the text.

IV Kgdms. 3:10, A text, makes little sense.

We have set out all the references in which the verb is used so that we may accurately assess its meaning. It appears, by way of conclusion, that the word conveys the negative sense of 'keep back', 'hold on to', 'restrain', 'detain' as well as the positive, 'seize', 'possess', 'have'. It is interesting that we do not find an instance of the sense 'hold sway', 'rule' (or 'occupy' in the same way). There is no thought of exercising power, nor is there, directly, any thought of delay as Cullmann would wish.

#### B. Classical and Hellenistic Usage

Liddell and Scott in their A Greek-English Lexicon<sup>81</sup> give a comprehensive list of possible meanings for the verb. We shall cite all meanings and illustrate those we feel are pertinent to our study.

#### A. Transitive

##### I.1.a. hold fast (only one example is given).

Hesiod. Theog. 575, κατὰ κρήθεν δὲ καλύπτρην  
διαδαλέην χεῖρεσσι κατέσχεσθε θαῦρα ἰδέσθαι.

'And down from her head she held with her hands, a bordered veil, a wonder to see'. Not a very clear example!

##### b. hold back, withhold, restrain. (Numerous examples).

Plato, Phaedo 117d, ἐπειδὴ οὐχ οἷός τ' ἦν  
κατέχειν τὰ δάκρυα.

'He, (Crito), could not restrain his tears'.

Sophocles, Electra 1011, κατάσχεσ, ὀργήν .

'restrain thy wrath'

Oed. Col. 874, οὐτοὺ καθέξω θυρόν,  
'restrain my will'.

c. detain

Thucydides, Hist. 8.100, καὶ νορίσας αὐτὸν  
καθέξειν αὐτοῦ,  
'Thrasyllus hopes to keep, detain, Mindorus at Chios'.

d. in imprecations, inhibit

e. place under arrest

f. keep an oath

2. with gen. gain possession of, be master of.

1 Mac. 6:27 (control), III Kgdms. 1:51 (cling to)

II.1.a. possess, occupy especially of rulers. (Three examples)

Aeschylus, Septem contra Thebas 731, χθόνα  
ναίειν διαπήλας, 732 ὅποσαν καὶ φθιρένοισιν  
κατέχειν, 'The cruel steel which allots so much  
ground to dwell on, as they hold when slain', or  
'occupy in death'.

Euripides, Hecuba 81, τὴν χιονώδη θρήκην  
κατέχει ξείνου πατρίου φυλακαῖσιν,

'Save my son, who ... inhabits the snowy Thrace  
under the protection of ... '.

Isocrates, Panath. 12:242, σώσειν ἅπερ αὖ  
ἅπαξ κατέσχωσι, 'and safeguard whatever they  
have once made their own'. None of these

references have the connotation 'hold sway' or  
apply to the thought of 'ruling'. They do,  
however, have parallel usage in the LXX.

- b.  dwell in, occupy
  - 2. of sound,  fill
  - 3.  continue to live a life
  - 4.  to be spread over, cover
  - 5. of the grave,  confine, cover
  - 6.a. of circumstances etc.,  hold fast, have one in their power
  - b. of circumstances, etc.,  prevail
- Herodotus,  Hist. 6:40, ταῦτα μὲν δὴ τρίτῳ ἔτει  
 πρότερον ἐγγόνεσσιν αὐτοῦ τότε μὲν κατεχόντων,  
 'All this happened three years before that which now  
 occupied him'.
- Sophocles,  Ajax 142, μεγάλοι θόρυβοι κατέχουσ' ἡμᾶς,  
 'murmurs are rife among us'
- 7.  seize, occupy. Especially in historical writers.
- Herodotus,  Hist. 5:72, 'Ὡς γὰρ ἀνέβη εἰς τὴν ἀκρ-  
 όπολιν μέλλων δὴ αὐτὴν κατασχέσειν ...  
 'When he went up to the Acropolis with the purpose  
 of taking possession of it ...'.
- Xenophon,  Cyr. 3.1.27, 'construct fortifications to  
 occupy the strong points of the land', τὰ ἐχυρὰ  
 κατέχειν.
- 8.  achieve, effect an object
  - 9.a.  master, understand, grasp
  - b.  keep in mind, remember
  - 10.  possess of a god
- Mostly in the Passive, of persons,  to be possessed,  
 inspired

Plato, Ion 533e, Socrates talks of the poet's need to be inspired or possessed by a god (κατέχορε) in order to write beautiful poems.

ibid. 536a, Ion says that people speak of a poet and say he is κατέχεται.

ibid. 536b, some poets are κατέχει ἐξ Ὀμήρου.

III. follow close upon, press hard

IV. bring a ship to land

B. Intransitive

1.a. control oneself

b. stop, cease

2. come from the high sea to shore, put in

3. prevail

Thucydides, Hist.1.10, The report prevails, ὁ λόγος κατέχεται that the expedition was as great as the poets related.

ibid. 3.89, About these times when the earthquakes happened, (prevailed).

4. gain the upper hand, gain one's purpose

C. Med.

I.1. keep both for oneself, embezzle

2. cover oneself

3. hold, contain

II.1. Aor. Med. = κατέχω B.2.

2. in pass. sense, subdued, was seized with



We have tried to set out meanings of the verb which are well-established or else have been used in our passage. On the evidence cited the idea of 'hold sway' does not appear to be substantiated.

#### C. Papyri Usage

Moulton-Milligan<sup>82</sup> have provided many examples to illustrate the negative and positive aspects. P. Fay 109:11 (early 1st A.D.)  $\mu\eta$  κατάσχῃς κλέων καὶ συν-  
 προσ[γενοῦ] κλέων 'Do not detain Cleon, but go and meet him'.  
 Coptic Ostraca No. 522, a heathen charm.  $\kappa\rho\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma$   $\delta$  κατέχων  
 τὸν θυρὸν ὅλων τῶν ἀνθρώπων κάτεχε τὸν θυρὸν  
 'Ὡς κ.τ.λ. 'Cronos, who restrains the wrath of all men,  
 restrain ...'. P. Oxy XII.1483:13 (2/3rd A.D.)  $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\nu$   $\mu\eta$   
 διὰ τάχους πᾶν τελέῃς ... τὸν ἐγγυητήν σου κατέχω.  
 'Unless you pay all quickly, I shall seize your security'.  
 Many other examples are given of 'seize', 'possess' and  
 'take possession of'.

#### D. Usage in Christian Writers

Lampe<sup>83</sup> gives helpful examples of the various uses of the word including a section with reference to II.2:6f. Chrysostom takes κατέχω in the sense of κωλύω  
Dioq. Ep. 6:7, 'Christians are confined, (detained), in the world as in a prison'. Καὶ χριστιανοὶ κατέχονται μὲν  
 ὡς ἐν φρουρᾷ κόσμῳ<sup>84</sup>. The meanings 'hold fast' and 'possess' are clearly present, although no examples are given of the latter sense in the Apostolic Fathers.

### E. New Testament Usage

In the N.T. the verb occurs seventeen times (excluding one v.l.) The basic sense of 'hold on to' appears with both a negative and positive application<sup>85</sup>. On the positive side we have the following references. Hold on to the word, Lk. 8:15; traditions, I Cor. 11:2; the gospel, I Cor. 15:2; the good, I.5:21; boldness and confidence, Heb. 3:6,14; and the confession of our faith, Heb. 10:23. Christians possess all, II Cor. 6:10 and must buy as though they possessed not, I Cor. 7:30.

On the negative side; the crowd wanted to detain Christ, Lk. 4:42; hold down the truth in unrighteousness, Rom. 1:18; bound by the law, Rom. 7:6; detained (Onesimus) with me, Phlm. 13. If Jn. 5:4 "disease by which he was held captive" is omitted p<sup>66,75</sup> & B C\*D, only two references do not fit into either category<sup>86</sup>. So we have, excluding II.2:6f., five positive texts and three negative ones in Paul<sup>87</sup>.

Giblin<sup>88</sup> has paid special attention to texts which occur in (a) cursing formula, (b) Serapium references, (c) sundry references to Dionysiac ecstasy. With regard to the first, Giblin is hard put to draw a distinction between κατέχω and καταδέω with which it is frequently associated<sup>89</sup>. In the second κατέχω and/or κατόχοι are used of those connected to the Serapium. The terms may denote ecstatic seizure or prisoners of God. We cannot base too much upon these references therefore, and Giblin himself thinks it unlikely Paul alludes to these specifically. Thirdly, there are texts (nearly always using the Passive and participle forms) in which the verb denotes those seized by

Dionysiac power as well as other texts which speak of 'god-possession', cf. Plutarch and Plato.

If we agree that the word does mean 'inspiration' and 'possession' two questions must be resolved.

1. How does this help our understanding of II.2? Gibling becomes unclear at this point. Paul, he agrees, is not saying the Thessalonians are 'possessed', but if an object has to be supplied "conceptually (not grammatically) it would be  $\delta\pi\alpha\rho\varsigma$ ". In other words the ones in danger of being possessed are the Thessalonians. It would be better if Gibling did not try to bring in Dionysiac references at this point and kept to his understanding of the word as 'seize'.

2. Can we consider 'possession' in view of the use of the active participle? Gibling has noted (see above) that this is rare.

#### Conclusion to the Study of $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega$ .

We have set out the evidence for the use of the verb and shown that a variety of meanings exist which can be used in our passage, providing the context suits them. At the same time we can be a little more specific in our conclusions by considering the following points.

(a) If Paul was wanting to denote some kind of 'possession' we would have expected him to use the Passive, or some other verb.

(b) There is no firm evidence for using 'occupy' or 'possess' in the sense of 'rule', 'hold sway'<sup>90</sup>.

(c) Paul uses the verb in a negative or positive sense. This may or may not help us, since it is possible the word is used as a technical term. However we have shown that the basic idea of the verb is 'hold on to, to oneself'<sup>91</sup>.

(d) The participles are not given complements and the use of the article appears to indicate that they are to be treated as nouns<sup>92</sup>. In which case we must find a meaning which can be used intransitively.

(e) The context must remain the governing factor in any interpretation.

### III. A Theocentric Understanding of the Katechon

A careful study must now be made of 2:6-12 and in particular vv.6,7.

#### 1. Thessalonian Knowledge, 6a

Καὶ νῦν τὸ κατέχον οἴδατε.

Clearly the ταῦτα of verse 5 refers to the two signs mentioned in verses 3 and 4. Paul is saying that his readers ought to be able to know that the Day is still future. He had repeatedly told them (ἐλέγον). Whether or not we include v.6f. will remain uncertain. However it is clear Paul is saying that at the time of writing they know the Katechon. They could have deduced it, have been taught about

it, or even experienced its function.

As with  $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$  too much emphasis ought not to be placed upon the  $\kappa\alpha\iota \nu\upsilon\nu$  of the opening statement. If a Katechon solution depends upon taking this in a particular way, we must regard it as suspect. The  $\kappa\alpha\iota \nu\upsilon\nu$  may re-inforce the  $\omicron\iota\delta\alpha\tau\epsilon$  indicating that the phrase is temporal and the sense is 'And now i.e. at this time of writing ...'. But can we give it a more definite sense?

(i) Some scholars are quite content to regard it as a general time reference, "and at this present time ..." <sup>93</sup>.

(ii) Others prefer to make a contrast with verse 5,  $\epsilon\tau\iota \omega\nu \pi\rho\acute{o}s \upsilon\pi\alpha\rho\varsigma$  <sup>94</sup>. Against this is the fact that Paul might have used some other expression <sup>95</sup>. Moreover we must question any contrast, seeing that Paul only broke off to administer a mild rebuke, before returning to the theme of II.2. Added to which we have to connect it to  $\omicron\iota\delta\alpha\tau\epsilon$  which immediately makes us ask, 'What new knowledge had they and how?' If Giblin is correct in taking  $\omicron\iota\delta\alpha$  to mean experiential knowledge <sup>96</sup>, it is still possible to have a contrast with v.5. However  $\nu\upsilon\nu$  is not very close to  $\omicron\iota\delta\alpha\tau\epsilon$ .

(iii) Cullmann <sup>97</sup> attaches  $\nu\upsilon\nu$  to  $\tau\omicron \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\nu$  which indicates a contrast between verse 5 and/or 6b. Again we would expect  $\nu\upsilon\nu$  to be placed in closer proximity to  $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\nu$  or Paul to have used perhaps  $\delta\prime\rho\tau\iota$  or  $\eta\delta\eta$  as in 7a,b.

It is possible to take καὶ ὅσον in a logical sense and translate, 'consequently, you know ...'.<sup>98</sup> This sense or no. (i) seem to be the most likely possibilities. What Paul is doing is bringing the readers back to his break in thought at verse 4.

If, and with good reason, we take οἶδα<sup>99</sup> in the way Gibling has suggested, the verb itself makes it clear that no new information is being given in the letter. Gibling<sup>100</sup> says there are two basic kinds of knowledge conveyed by οἶδα; conceptual (speculative) and experiential. For the first he refers to I.4:5; 5:2; II.1:8 and for the second I.1:5; 2:1; 3:4. To the second list we could add, I.2:2,5; 4:2; II.3:7. If we look carefully at these texts we can see that the knowledge referred to is that gained by experience. In other words we can translate, 'you know from experience, you are aware of ...'. Gibling notes that most commentators treat οἶδα in a conceptual way, but applying his sense to II.2:6 the writer is saying, 'And now, you are experiencing, or aware of in reality, the Katechon'.<sup>101</sup> If conceptual knowledge is in view (You know about) then our understanding of the Katechon will not be greatly affected but for Gibling it is imperative that he treats it experientially. However this sense is well-founded.



## 2. The Relation of the Katechon to εἰς τὸ' & the Meaning of 6b.

Giblin<sup>102</sup> finds it necessary to consider in detail the relation of εἰς τὸ κ.τ.λ. with 6a, which he argues is dependent on the main verb οἴδατε and introduces a result; there is no parallel, he adds, for making it dependent on a participle. His translation "And now you know the Seizing power for his being manifested at his own (proper) time" does not make good sense and it shows the clause to be dependent on κατέχων<sup>103</sup>. His "for" hardly seems to introduce a result, but appears to be causal.

We have already examined εἰς τὸ' in detail and take the sense we argued for in II.2:2, namely purpose (or possibly result)<sup>104</sup>. Our translation will read therefore, 'You are experiencing the κατέχων in order that (so that) he, αὐτόν, may be revealed ...'. This makes far better sense. It means (a) εἰς τὸ' depends on οἴδατε and (b) the Katechon is treated absolutely. It also provides a clue for the right meaning of κατέχω. If positive and hostile as well as parallel to αὐτόν (v.6b) we have problems finding a good translation for εἰς τὸ', but if negative the verse makes very good sense.

There is one problem to be faced. To whom does αὐτόν refer?

(1) The Katechon? But why do we have a neuter and then a masculine reference? The only possible explanation is that πνεῦμα has affected κατέχων, when really the mystery is personal, as v.6b and 7b,c.<sup>105</sup>

2. Christ?<sup>106</sup> The subject is too far away, 2:2.
3. The Man of lawlessness?<sup>107</sup> This is most likely, and especially if ἐαυτοῦ is read. But whether the reading is ἐαυτοῦ or αὐτοῦ, God (or Satan) could be in mind here.

We can omit any discussion of the meaning of ἀποκαλύπτω. We have already indicated our understanding of the verb; public disclosure of a person<sup>108</sup>. We reject any idea of 'taken in judgment'. We must mention however that the verb is in the passive tense, which indicates that it is not the Anomos who reveals himself. If this were so it would be quite out of keeping with the passage. The Agent can be

- (i) Satan We read that the parousia of the Anomos is due to Satan. But we have seen parousia means more than coming-presence, because,

(a) the description<sup>of</sup> the parousia involves power, signs and lying wonders which imply a period of time.

(b) ἐνέργεια means 'possessing' rather than 'at work' in 2:9.

(c) God sends the Lie = the Anomos, according to 2:11.

- (ii) God In view of what we have just said and the fact that God alone, in Paul's view, would have the right and authority to bring about this kind of 'anti-revelation' to Christ we are probably correct in accepting God's agency. We do not even need to read αὐτοῦ of God. The whole expression "to be

revealed in his time" must mean in "the time appointed for him".

The important word in 6b is not καιρός . Barr is quite right to point out that the idea of 'a decisive time appointed by God' cannot be limited to a lexical word or stock<sup>109</sup>. However quite a number of contexts do indicate that this is what the word means. The same is true of our text. The whole passage, to our mind, shows God's fixed eschatological plan, and the temporal particles and the future verbs are together indicative of this. The Day of the Lord has not come because God's appointed time for certain events has not been reached.

### 3. The Mystery of Lawlessness 7a

Γάρ is explanatory in that it introduces a comment upon the relationship between the function of the Katechon and the revelation of the Anomos. What kind of comment depends on our exegesis of v.7a and in particular of the expression, 'mystery of lawlessness'.

The most important word is μυστήριον<sup>110</sup> because of the way it is separated from its genitive<sup>111</sup>. Many commentators assert that 'mystery' in the N.T. refers to a secret, whose content, otherwise unknown by human understanding, is revealed<sup>112</sup>. This is not strictly true, since it is the context which gives the meaning of 'revealed secret'. It is used in association with

ἀποκαλύπτω (-ψις) Rom. 16:25; Eph. 3:3,5.

γινώρισω Eph. 1:9; 3:3; 6:19.

λαλέω I Cor. 2:7; Col. 4:3.

The word occurs predominantly in the singular but it is found four times in the plural, Mt. 13:11 = Lk. 8:10; I Cor. 4:1; 13:2; 14:2. It has a variety of meanings<sup>113</sup>, other than the general one of 'revealed secret'; I Cor. 13:2, 'mysteries' refers to all religious knowledge; Rev. 1:20; 17:5,7, 'symbolic meaning'; Rev. 10:7, mysterious will of God and Rom. 11:25; 16:25; I Cor. 15:51, hidden purpose or secret plan.

If we consider its use in the LXX (Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, II Maccabees) we again find a varied usage. Mysteries of God, Wis. 2:22; 6:22; disclosing secrets of private life, Ecclus. 22:22; 27:16; symbolic dream, Dan. 2:18,19,27 et al.; cf. Rev. 1:20. There are three references for the thought of 'secret plan' which we need to examine more closely in view of what we shall argue later. Tob. 12:7,11, 'It is a good thing to safeguard the mystery (i.e. secret counsel or plan) of the king' Judith. 2:2, 'The king communicated to them his mystery (i.e. revealed his secret plan to his servants)'. II Mac. 13:21, 'Rhodocus, who was within the Jewish host, disclosed the mysteries (i.e. secret plans of the Jews) to the enemy'.

Quite a few scholars have set II.2 against the background of Qumran<sup>114</sup>. Whilst denying direct influence they are impressed by parallels. The word 'mystery' was clearly very popular among the members of the community and it features in a wide range of the literature found there. The following points can be made from a study of the material available.

- (a) At Qumran the word (  $\text{לִּפְתָּח}$  ) is used most frequently in the plural although it is found in the singular in e.g. IQS 11:3f.; IQ27.1:3. From the N.T. we have given above the only four examples of plural use from a total of twenty seven occurrences of the word.
- (b) The vast majority refer to God, IQS 3:23; IQM 3:9; 16:11; IQpHab. 7:8, or one of his attributes such as wisdom  $\text{חֵכְמָה}$  IQS 4:18, or knowledge  $\text{דַּעַת}$  IQS 4:6. Often  $\text{סֵפֶת$  is attached to the noun because they are his wonderful mysteries, IQS 9:18; CD 3:18.
- (c) Over against God's mysteries are those of Belial. These are mentioned in a very few texts. In IQM 14:9 we have 'mysteries of his (i.e. Belial's) hatred' IQH 5:36; f50:5; IQ27.1:2 'mysteries of sin' and IQ27.f13:3 'mysteries of the abyss'. However any secrets of Belial and evil are under the control of God.
- IQS 3:22f. By the dominion of the Angel of Darkness men commit evil in accordance with the mysteries of God.
- IQS 4:18. In the mysteries of His understanding, and in His glorious wisdom, God has ordained an end for falsehood.
- IQM 3:8f. Upon the trumpets of ambush they shall write, 'Mysteries of God for the perdition of wickedness'.

IQM 16:9. Skirmishers are allowed to fall according to God's mysteries, and thereby test all those destined for battle, cf. 17:17.

IQpHab. 7:8. God's mysteries of wisdom may prolong the final age i.e. implying evil still continues.

- (d) It is unlikely that IQ27.1:7 is a parallel to II.2:7. The Hebrew text as read by Barthélemy-Milik<sup>115</sup> is וְכֹל תּוֹמָכִי רָזִי פֶלֶא is וְכֹל תּוֹמָכִי רָזִי פֶלֶא ( ) Vermes and others<sup>116</sup> wish to read and translate, "All who cleave to the mysteries of sin ( וְכֹל תּוֹמָכִי רָזִי פֶלֶא ) shall be no more" which is quite different from 'holding back wonderful mysteries'. The text is too uncertain for us to make a sound judgment, although Betz believes we can<sup>117</sup>.
- (e) Whereas in the N.T. the emphasis comes to be placed on the 'secret revealed', in the DSS the emphasis lies on the mystery which still exists. In other words it is by God's "mysteries" (the most appropriate translation) He does or brings things to pass.

Four things emerge from a consideration of this word which do find echoes in II.2.

(i) There are counterpart mysteries to those of God. In II.2:7 we have a counterpart to the mystery of Christ.

(ii) רָזִי in a few places yields the meaning, 'plans', 'purposes', e.g. IQS 3:23; 4:18; IQM 16:9 and in these



instances the content is revealed. This parallels the N.T. concept of the 'secret revealed'.

(iii) God allows evil to prevail even if 'the Sons of light' suffer for a while (IQM 16:9) and apostasy becomes a reality (IQS 3:23; cf. II.2:3f., 8-10).

(iv) Evil has an appointed end, IQS 4:18; cf. II.2:8,12.

We cannot say with assurance that Paul borrowed from Qumran but it provided part of the milieu from which his thought arose and there are too many similarities for it to be ignored. Having surveyed the background to the word, and especially that at Qumran, we must return to the question with which we began this section. 'What comment is 7a making on verse 6?' Have we in 7a a genitive of apposition<sup>118</sup>, quality<sup>119</sup>, content<sup>120</sup> or agent<sup>121</sup>? Is the emphasis on the secretly working anomia which is to culminate in the Anomos figure? These views share one thing in common: Paul is understood to be describing evil in the world, which heralds The Final Evil Figure. So reference is frequently made to I Jn.2:18; 4:3<sup>122</sup> whilst the Church Fathers saw in Nero and the heretics the growth of lawlessness from which Antichrist would come<sup>123</sup>. To confirm this approach stress is laid on the ἤδη (already). Even in Paul's day lawless events were taking place which in one sense were secret yet ultimately linked to a public disclosure of the Antichrist.

We must question this interpretation. The γάρ has a closer connection with the last statement of 6b, which concerns the Anomos. So it seems that the best translation

of μυστήριον is 'purpose' or 'secret plan', with the subjective genitive denoting possession. "For the secret plan of (belonging to) Anomia is already at work". The emphasis lies on the production of Antichrist (his revelation, 6b), not evil leading up to Antichrist. It is noteworthy that those who take it differently cannot eradicate the idea of the coming of the Anomos. The verse is not making any comment on how the plan is at work; it is only stating the fact that whilst the Anomos will be revealed in God's time, there is a secret plan belonging to Anomia which is at work<sup>124</sup>. In effect Anomia has become personified, but in the light of ἐμαρτία in Rom. 7:7-25 this is not strange.

The verb ἐνεργέω is almost certainly passive. 'Mystery' is always associated with passive verbs in the N.T. in addition to which a number of passive verbs are used in II.2 a similar way. If the secret plan has been set in motion, who is its source? The choice lies with the Anomos, Satan, the Katechon (if hostile) or God. It is unlikely to be the Antichrist figure and we consider the Katechon to be other than hostile. Satan is a likely figure but in view of our argument that God discloses the Man of lawlessness, 6b, we consider the same person sets the secret plan in operation. To attribute this to God's design is in accordance with the belief that all is beneath God's control, cf. Amos 3:6; IQS 3:23; Rev. 20:3.

#### 4. Verse 7b and c and the Purpose of Μόνον.

The μόνον appears to set some form of limitation on the 'mystery of lawlessness'. In our view the idea of limitation accords better with κατέχω in a negative rather than positive sense. It is strange if the argument is, 'The mystery of Anomia is already set in operation, only (or only until) the hostile person who is now, will be removed'. Giblin<sup>125</sup> recognises this difficulty for his own theory and spends considerable effort trying to prove that μόνον has no temporal force. Μόνον, he argues, is concessive ('But', cf. Gal. 5:13), and to be understood as an imperatival construction, 'But let the κατέχω be what he is right now, until he is ousted'. This is one more example of special pleading and arises from the difficulty he and others face if they posit two hostile forces in v.7.

As the text stands. ( μόνον δ κατέχων ἄρτι ἕως ἐκ πέσου γένηται ) it is possible to take it in two ways, although the meaning seems little affected either way. In both cases μόνον has the sense of 'but', except that it introduces a situation not a concession.

##### (i) 'Only the Katechon now'

The situation is that the Katechon exists at the present and so we need to add ἔστιν. However if κατέχων is treated (wrongly) as a participle, we should probably add 'let him hold back (or seize now)'. The following ἕως will set a limit on the κατέχων. It is very unlikely that the subject of γένηται is other than the κατέχων as we would expect a different subject to be specified<sup>126</sup>.

(ii) 'Only until the Katechon now is out of the way'

Here there is no doubt about the subject of γένηται. The situation is that the secret of Anomia will remain so until ... . The connection with 7a is not as good as the first translation and really requires πόνον δέ , 'but only until ... '. and the verb ἐστιν , or preferably ἐνεστώς , I Cor. 3:22; Gal. 1:4. We consider the first suggestion to be the better and translate accordingly, "The secret plan of Anomia is set in operation, but the Katechon is (exists) now, until ... And then ... ".

What does ἐκ πέσου γέν. mean? Giblin gives it a very strong force of 'be ousted',<sup>127</sup> others 'be removed',<sup>128</sup> and more recently, 'disappear to reappear',<sup>129</sup>. At least the last suggestion has the merit of showing that the clause does not necessarily imply 'ceasing' or the manner of 'removal'. All the text states is that the Katechon will come out of the middle. One problem which has been frequently raised is how it is possible for God or the Holy Spirit or other spiritual forces to 'cease'? Unfortunately the uniqueness of the phrase in the Greek Bible does not help us to solve this, nor do references to the expression ἄνω ἐκ πέσου which is frequent in the O.T. (e.g. Gen. 35:2; Is. 57:2).

Fulford<sup>130</sup> has demonstrated that the clause can denote voluntary action. To support this he cites Herodotus, Hist. 3:83, where Otanes τοῦ πέσου καθῆστο , 'withdrew from the contest' and Plutarch, Tim. 238B, where the hero makes up his mind to withdraw (leave) his previous way of life ὅν καὶ ἐαυτὸν, ἐκ π. γένομενος . 'There are other

references which confirm this conclusion.

Herodotus, Hist. 4:118, ὅρεῖς ὧν μηδὲν τρόκῳ ἐκ π. κατήμενοι.

The Scythian legation tell their barbarian neighbours to be part of the contest, 'Do not stand aloof'.

ibid. 8:22, καὶ νῦν ἐκ τ. π. ἡμῖν ἔσσεσθε.

'even now withdraw from the war'.

Plutarch, Moralia 150D. After the minstrel had played

Melissa withdrew (ἐκ μέσου μετέστη).

Xenophon, Anabasis. I.v.14 'You ordered him to remove himself, withdraw' (ἐκελευσέτε τε αὐτὸν ἐκ τ. π. ἐξίστασθαι).

So with some verbs the clause can express voluntary withdrawal. In addition to which γίνομαι used with ἐκ (τινός)<sup>131</sup> can take an indefinite sense of 'come' and the spatial aspect is relatively unimportant.

Mk.1:11, καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

= Lk. 3:22 καὶ φωνὴ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι.

Lk. 9:35, καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο (ἦλθεν, D) ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης.

Dan. 4:31, Theod. ἔτι τοῦ λόγου ἐν στόματι τοῦ

Βασιλέως ὅντος φωνὴ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐγένετο.

II Mac. 2:21, καὶ τῆς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενομένης ἐπιφανείας τοῖς . . . . .

Similarly in II.2:7, 'until he comes from the midst'. The passive of γίνομαι is used frequently in I.1:5,6; 2:5, 7,8,10,14; 3:5.

So the objection which we voiced, can be answered in two ways.

1. Ἐκ πέσου plus a verb can within certain contexts mean other than compulsory removal.
2. Ἰνὸς plus ἔκ can have an indefinite connotation. In our view the clause 'come out of the midst', means 'withdraws'<sup>132</sup>. If God withdraws, where does he withdraw to? This question is as pointless as asking the Seer how did the angel come down from heaven, Rev. 10:1 or the Beast appear from the sea, 13:1. Spatial references are suggestive of 'spiritual truth' rather than visual facts.

##### 5. The Activity of God, 10-12

Finally we look at a very neglected area at the end of the pericope where, in our view, we have in vv.10-12 a basis for understanding the figure and function of the Katechon. We shall therefore set out the following points.

- (a) The people upon whom the Anomos exercises his influence are those who are perishing, v.10. They are further described as those who did not receive the love of the truth cf. II.1:8 and the Aorist, ἐδέξαντο shows that this was a deliberate rejection. It is the reason why the Anomos finds such fertile ground. These people have known the truth but deliberately spurned it. If we only had these statements we would be left with the impression that Satan and the Anomos had taken advantage of a situation but this is not so.



- (b) Verse 11 dispels this idea. God sends<sup>133</sup>  
 ( κέρπει )<sup>134</sup> an error which takes hold of  
 them. It is God not Satan who orders all things.

i καὶ διὰ τοῦτο shows the grounds  
 for God's judgment - it is consequent on  
 deliberate rejection, cf. v.12<sup>135</sup>.

ii κέρπει is present. There is a  
 definite parallel with ἐστίν, v.9.  
 Although the Anomos' presence (parousia) is  
 (exists and continues) by Satan's ἐνέργεια  
 there is a complementary and yet paradoxical  
 thought. God sends the Lie. The latter is  
 dependent upon God's will. So long as God  
sends, the parousia of the Antichrist figure  
 continues. The very same sentiment is found  
 later in Rev. 17:17, "For God did put in their  
 hearts to do his (probably = God's mind and to  
 come to one mind, and to give their kingdom  
 unto the beast, until the words of God should  
 be accomplished". cf. with 17:13.

iii The error working in 'the perishing'  
 produces faith in the Lie, ( τὸ ψεύδος ).  
 In view of the number of definite articles, which  
 identify someone or thing in our passage as  
 unique, it is probable we should treat ψεύδος  
 in the same way<sup>136</sup>. We have, The Man of  
 Lawlessness, the Apostasy, The Anomos and  
 The Katechon (ὄν). The expression εἰς τὸ

πιστεῖσθε + Dat., which occurs again in Paul only in two O.T. citations, Rom. 4:3; 10:16, underlines the commitment made; it is to a person not what he says. The Aorist infinitive is indicative of this.

We have tried to show in our exegesis of II.2:6ff. that a 'hostile' understanding of κατέχω does not suit the passage. If we use a 'negative' sense of the verb (restrain) and treat the two participles as substantives we must translate, The Restraint and the Restrainer; the former being quite naturally the function of the latter. If we use the various points we have made from 2:6,7 about the theocentric nature of the section (God sets in operation and appoints the time), together with verses 10-12, we are led to one conclusion. The Katechōn is a reference to God<sup>137</sup>. Then why did not Paul write 'God'? If, as we have argued, the Thessalonians had been instructed in eschatological matters they would recall that God ordained times and seasons (I.5:1), which is what II.2 deals with. Who else could the Restrainer be? Paul knew that they would know who was meant but used the verb κατέχω to emphasize the holding back of the appearance of the Anomos. If too, Paul had said πόσον ὁ θεὸς ἄρτι some could even suppose God might cease to exist. Paul has in mind God in the role of Restrainer and for that reason has used κατέχω. If the two participles are treated as substantives there is nothing mysterious in the passage. He is not alluding cryptically to the

Roman Empire or Emperor. Moreover the thought of God sending the Lie is another way of looking at God withdrawing. There is no apparent difficulty in viewing God in the role of Katechōn.

Our translation of II.2:6f. runs as follows:

And now, you are experiencing the restraint in order that he, the Anomos, will be disclosed in God's appointed time. For the secret plan of Anomia is already in operation, but the Restrainer is now, until he withdraws. And then ...

At the outset of this chapter we listed a certain number of points which had to be taken into account if a satisfactory solution was to be found.

- (a) We have used a well-established meaning of the word 'restrain'. In addition the two particles are treated as substantives which is how they appear to be used by Paul.
- (b) We have argued, from a close study of the chapter, that the passage is emphasizing a theocentric approach to eschatological matters. The Day of the Lord cannot have come because certain God-ordained events have not occurred. They cannot occur until God withdraws.
- (c) We have given a solution which will have a relevant meaning for the church community. V.6, 'You are experiencing the restraint'. They would have no difficulty in understanding the way God holds back evil.
- (d) We have paid attention to the relationship of masculine and neuter, and the translation 'Restrainer' and 'restraint'

shows a person and his function.

(e) We have not yet dealt with the theology of Paul.

There is nothing in Paul even remotely similar to the idea of God (or for that matter the Roman Empire etc.) preventing an evil force from breaking out. But there is nothing parallel to the idea of the Anomos either. We have in II.2 two ideas which without question have origins in earlier Jewish and Christian material but are developed by Paul in his own way. However we also have the idea of 'withdrawing' and 'sending', II.2:7,11 and there are points of contact for these ideas in other Pauline letters.

Rom. 1:24, God delivers up (παρέδωκεν) those who have already rejected clear knowledge of God, v.19f. Their punishment is a positive surfeit of evil pleasures, v.26ff.

Rom. 9:18, God hardens (σκληρύνει) whom he will.

An example has been given, that of Pharaoh at the Exodus, Ex. 9:16. Yet he has already rejected God.

Rom. 11:8, a quotation from Is. 29:10. God gave (ἔδωκεν) the Jews a spirit of stupor, which is proof of his hardening of the Israelites of Paul's day.

I Cor. 5:4,5. By the power of Jesus an immoral man is delivered (παράσποναι) to Satan (cf. 'in order that they should believe the Lie, II.2:11).

When we widen the horizon to look at earlier material the background to our passage is illuminated considerably. In the Old Testament we find the following points made. References are the M.T. with the LXX in brackets

where appropriate.

1. God is Responsible for Sending Sin

Judg. 9:23f. God sent ( ἐξαπέστειλεν ) an evil spirit between Abimelech and the men of Shechem because of the murder of Jerubbaal's sons.

I Sam. 16:14. The spirit of God departed ( ἀπέστη ) from Saul and an evil spirit from the Lord worried him.

Josh. 24:20. 'If you forsake the Lord ... he will turn and do you evil'.

Judg. 16:20. The Lord's departure ( ἀπέστη ) from Samson means captivity and degradation.

Is. 19:14. God sent ( ἐκέρασε ) a spirit of perverseness which made Egypt go astray.

2. God Hardens Mens' Hearts or Makes them Act in a Particular Way

Usually this is because of previous sin.

Ex. 10:20,27; 11:10 etc. Pharaoh's heart was hardened.

Dt. 2:30. Sihon's heart was hardened, so he refuses a passage for Israel.

Jos. 11:20. Certain peoples were hardened by God, so as to fight the Israelites and be defeated. The reason is given in Dt. 20:18.

I Sam. 2:25. Eli's sons refused to listen because the Lord would slay them.

I Kings 12:15. Rehoboam failed to listen because the Lord had planned it. The reason is given in 11:11,31.

II Sam. 24:1 = I Chron. 21:1. God and Satan are said to have made David number the Israelites.

### 3. God Gives Sinners Up

Ps. 81:12, 'I let them go after the stubbornness of their own hearts'.

Ezek. 20:39. 'Go serve your idols'.

Judg. 2:14; 6:1; 13:1; II Kings 13:3; 17:20 all speak of God delivering Israel into the hands of other nations because of their sin.

### 4. God Allows a Particular Period of Evil

Jer. 29:10, Seventy years for the Exiles.

Dan. 7:25; 12:7, Time, times and half a time.

Dan. 12:11, 1290 days, cf. Asc. Is. 4:12, Antichrist for 3 years, 7 months, 27 days.

Dan. 9:24, Seventy weeks.

Dan. 11:36, This is alluded in II.2:4. 'He shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished for that which is determined shall be done'.

These ideas find expression in other Jewish literature. We have already cited passages in Qumran which stress that God controls evil and allows it to flourish<sup>138</sup>. A very important text is found in CD 8:2

so shall it be for all the members of His Covenant who do not hold steadfastly to these (MS.B: to the curse of the precepts). They shall be visited for destruction by the hand of Satan. That shall be the day when God will visit ... (vermes).



We could not have a closer parallel with II.2.

- i. God visits ( 7קפ ); Satan (Belial) visits (also 7קפ ).
- ii. Judgment falls upon apostates (8:1 חַיִּימוֹתֵינוּ )
- iii. An outline of the actions of apostates is given, e.g. revenge, malice, greed etc., CD 8:4ff.
- iv. After our quotation of CD 8:2f. there follows a quotation from Hos. 5:10. MS A is defective and corrupt but plainly it had the quotation which in MS. B follows the M.T.<sup>139</sup>. 'The princes of Judah have become like those who remove the bound', (Vermes: חַיִּימוֹתֵינוּ ).  
 חַיִּימוֹתֵינוּ means 'bound', 'limit' or 'border'. LXX has  
 ὡς περὶ τὸ ἐνέχον ὅριον so the idea of κατέχον  
 (restraint) is implied.

CD 2:13 mentions that those whom God hated he led astray, cf. IQS 3:22-24. A time of evil is called Belial's dominion, it is the age before the End, IQM 14:9; CD 4:12f.; IQS 1:17f.; 2:19; cf. I En. 9:10f. The war with the Sons of Darkness will last for forty years, IQM 2:8,9; CD 20:15; 4Qp Ps37.2:6ff. We ought, perhaps, also notice how clear IQS 3:17ff. is about the Angel of Darkness having subjects, children of falsehood, whose allegiance is never in doubt. The Anomos also has his devoted followers.

In Jubilees we find the same theme of God using Satan to bring about his own judgments. In chp. 10:1ff. the following points are to be noted.

i. Noah pleads for all evil spirits to be bound because they are already causing wickedness amongst his sons, vv.1,5.. God agrees to this prayer, v.7.

ii. Mastema, chief of spirits, pleads for their freedom to work amongst the sons of men who are already wicked, v.8.

iii. God grants this but only allows one tenth to be subject to Satan on earth. The rest are imprisoned, vv.9,11.

We have a clear assertion that these spirits are allowed scope for deceit and evil among men (Noah's sons are now excluded, v.13) under God's ultimate control. An example of this is found in 48:15,16. Mastema is bound for five days and then released to harden the hearts of the Egyptians and so bring about God's judgment on them.

In the New Testament we also find references to periods of evil. Lk. 22:53, 'your hour and the power of darkness', Rev. 11:2, the holy is city given to the nations for forty-two months, cf. 13:5; also 12:6,14. After a thousand years Satan must be loosed (δεῖ λυθῆναι) for a little time. In Acts 7:42 God turned and gave up (παρέδωκεν) the Jews to serve the host of heaven. In the light of Josh. 24:20 and Is. 63:10 it probably means God "turned away". We have already cited Rev. 17:17 to show how God orders evil to his own ends, cf. I Kings 12:15.

The four points from the O.T., illustrating God 'sending' evil, are the background to the Katechon. It is a belief continued in Qumran and accepted by Paul. The restraint is not to be seen merely in terms of 'holding back' but the revelation of the Anomos at the proper time. What is the proper time? V.12 provides the clue. The belief in the Lie is for the purpose of judgment, {ἡ κρίσις}. The Anomos is God's way of judging those who have committed apostasy. Those who have disobeyed God and ἐξεδουκῆσαντες τῇ ἀδικίᾳ will find their sin punished with sin. The particular calamity which befalls them is a figure who sums up all ἀδικία, v.10 and ἀνομία v.3. It is important that we see 'restraint' in this way. The idea of being an obstacle is secondary, as is any idea of delay (whether of the Anomos or Christ).

### Conclusion

We have sought to provide a satisfactory solution to the Katechon riddle. We have argued that only a theocentric theory will satisfy an exegesis and understanding of the passage<sup>140</sup>. There remains one question more. Why has the Katechon teaching apparently disappeared from Christian thought? Unfortunately we have too few extant Pauline letters upon which to make a judgment. No doubt if we had a much larger collection we would find elements relating both to the Anomos (who reappears in literature at the end of the first century, I Jn. Rev.) and the Katechon. On the other hand it may be that Paul's experience in teaching eschatology to newly

converted pagans convinced him that he must present such matters in a clearer way and leave no room for misunderstanding and error. As it is we possess one short passage in the N.T. in which these difficult matters (cf. II Pet. 3:16!) are presented in the context of missionary teaching of the early church. At least we are given a glimpse of some of the eschatological beliefs held during this period of the church's life.

<sup>1</sup>Civ. Dei, XX.19.2.

<sup>2</sup>Dibelius, p.37, made an attempt at grouping views under the headings 'zeitgeschichtlich' and 'traditions-geschichtlich'. For more recent views Frame, pp. 259ff.; Rigaux, 259ff.; O. Betz, 'Der Katechon' N.T.S. 9 (1962/63), 276-291, pp. 277ff., Giblin, pp. 18ff.

<sup>3</sup>See Apol. c.32.

<sup>4</sup>Ad Scapulam, 2, he writes that the Christian is not hostile to emperor or empire, so long as the world lasts.

<sup>5</sup>Adv. Haer. V.25.3; 26.1 and 30.2 implies, but does not state, that the Roman Empire is Daniel's fourth kingdom, which must give way to Antichrist.

<sup>6</sup>De Antichristo, 24.

<sup>7</sup>In their comments on II.2:1ff.

<sup>8</sup>Civ. Dei, XX.19.3.

<sup>9</sup>Apol. c.32.

<sup>10</sup>Quaes. ad Alq. 11.

<sup>11</sup>Op. cit., pp. 123ff.

<sup>12</sup>Hebrew, Jewish and Christian Eschatology, p. 382; Ascension, p. lxxiii.

<sup>13</sup>Op. cit., pp. 130ff. Masc. = Claudius and neut. his policy.

<sup>14</sup>P.325.

<sup>15</sup>Ad loc.

<sup>16</sup>Pp. 125f., 228.

<sup>17</sup>Ad loc.

<sup>18</sup>P.153.

<sup>19</sup>Ad loc. and Theology, p.238

<sup>20</sup>J.R. Richards, 'The Pauline Epistles: Their Chronological Relationship and Comparative Dates', N.T.S. 13, (1966/67) 14-30, pp. 27ff.

<sup>21</sup>p.114.

<sup>22</sup>p.101

<sup>23</sup>Tyndale, p.129, cf. Bailey, p.328.

<sup>24</sup>Op. cit., Bib. (1938), pp. 39-42. This view follows partly F. Prat, La Théologie de Saint Paul, Vol.I, Paris, 1913, pp. 115ff.: Masc = Michael: Neut. = his heavenly army.

<sup>25</sup>Op. cit., Like A. Strobel, Untersuchungen zum eschatologischen Verzögerungsproblem (N.T. Suppl., 2), Leiden, 1961, p.100 and against von Dobschütz, p.280 n.3. For criticism of Betz's theory, Gibling, pp. 168ff.

<sup>26</sup>'2 Thess. 2,6: "That which restrains" or "That which holds sway"? ' in Studia Evangelica, T.U., 102, Berlin 1968, pp. 442-451.

<sup>27</sup>p.260.

<sup>28</sup>Augustine, Civ. Dei, XX.19.3. Chrysostom, ad. loc.

<sup>29</sup>E.g. Chrysostom.

<sup>30</sup>, ὁ κατέχων 2<sup>o</sup>πτλ 2 Thess 2,7', Z.K.Th. 45 (1921), 455-475, pp. 461, 466.

<sup>31</sup>D. Buzy, 'L'Adversaire et l'Obstacle: II Thess., 2,3-12', R.de.S.R. 24 (1934) 402-431.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid , p.413.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid , p.430.

<sup>34</sup>O. Cullmann, 'Le caractère eschatologique du devoir, missionnaire et de la conscience apostolique de St. Paul. Étude sur le κατέχων (ωv) de 2. Thess. 2,6-7', R.H.P.R. 16 (1936) 210-245.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid , pp. 221ff., citing Sanh. 97b; Mid. Cant. 5:2 (118a); pTa 'anith 1:64a; As. Mos. 1:18; Tob. 13:6; Jub. 1:15,22; see Strack-Billerbeck, I, p.599 and II, p.589.



<sup>36</sup>P.228. Mal. 3:1; Ecclus. 48:10f.; 4 Ezra 6:26; Mk. 11:14; 17:10; Lk. 1:70.

<sup>37</sup>Mk. 13:10 = Mt. 24:15; Acts 1:6f.; 3:19; 10:42; II Pet. 3:12,15; Rev. 6:1-8; 19:11.

<sup>38</sup>J. Munck, Paul and the Salvation of Mankind (transl. by F. Clarke), London, 1959, pp. 36-43.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid , p.41.

<sup>40</sup>Pp. 102f.

<sup>41</sup>Resurrection and the New Testament (S.B.Th., 2nd Series, 12), London, 1970, p.155.

<sup>42</sup>In I Cor. 15:7ff. he is very conscious that he is one apostle among many. He mentions his call to preach but does not give it any eschatological significance, vv.11,14.

<sup>43</sup>Cf. Mt. 24:48; 25:5; Lk. 1:21 or possibly ὀκνέω Acts 9:38.

<sup>44</sup>It depends on which imprisonment, Caesarean, Ephesian or Roman. See Kümmel, Introduction, pp. 230ff.

<sup>45</sup>For a criticism of the theory, Rigaux, pp. 663f.; Masson, pp. 99f. and Giblin, pp. 21ff.

<sup>46</sup>See pp. 181ff. for a study of the meaning of the verb and pp. 176ff. 224ff. for the notion of a hostile threat to the community. Cf. too Best, pp. 301f.

<sup>47</sup>Pp. 159ff.

<sup>48</sup>P. 246.

<sup>49</sup>P.248 and 246 for the respective quotations.

<sup>50</sup>Cf. D.W.B. Robinson, op. cit., pp. 636f.

<sup>51</sup>P.37.

<sup>52</sup>P. 240.

<sup>53</sup>See pp. 205, 232, 245.

<sup>54</sup>Mt. 7:22f.; I Cor. 4:5.

<sup>55</sup>Op. cit., pp. 223ff.

<sup>56</sup>Pp. 42ff. (2nd edn.) = pp. 49ff. (3rd edn.).

<sup>57</sup>(Moffatt), pp. 166-173; (Peake), p.1000.

<sup>58</sup>Cullmann, (1936), p.215; Oepke, p.152; Whiteley, Theology, pp. 239f. and in the commentary, ad loc.

<sup>59</sup>Οἱ πέν τοῦ Πνεύματος τὴν χάριν φέρειν.

<sup>60</sup>'Die hemmende Macht im 2. Thessalonicher Brief', Pastor Bonus 25 (1913) 610-615.

<sup>61</sup>A. Strobel, op. cit., pp. 98-116.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid , p.102.

<sup>63</sup>Ibid , pp. 109f.

<sup>64</sup>Ibid ., p. 104.

<sup>65</sup>Op. cit., pp. 48ff.

<sup>66</sup>K. Grayston, The Letters of Paul to the Philippians and to the Thessalonians (Camb. Bible Comm.), Cambridge, 1967, p.103., says he is.

<sup>67</sup>A. Schäfer, Erklärung der zwei Briefe an die Thessalonicher, Münster, 1890, p.159.

<sup>68</sup>P.261.

<sup>69</sup>N.F. Freese, ' τὸ κατέχον und ὁ κατέχων (II Thess. 2,6-7)', Th.S.K. 93 (1920/21), 73-77. Cf. Giblin's comments, pp. 176f.

<sup>70</sup>J. Schmid, 'Der Antichrist und die hemmende Macht (2 Thess, 2, 1-12)', Th.Q. 129 (1949), 323-343.

<sup>71</sup>R. Knox, New Testament Commentary, Vol. II, London, 1954, pp. 312f.

<sup>72</sup>J. Coppens, 'Le "mystère" dans la Théologie Paulienne et ses parallèles Qumrâniens' in Littérature et Théologie: Recherches Bibliques V (ed. A. Descamps), Louvain, 1960, pp. 142-165 = Chp. 7 in Paul and Qumran, op. cit., pp. 132-158. See pp. 149, 164 of the original article.

<sup>73</sup> 'Celui qui retient la venue du Seigneur (2 Thess 2,6) ( τὸ κατέχον )', Bijdragen 21 (1960) 20-30.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid , pp. 24f.

<sup>75</sup> The neuter designates "la fonction impersonnelle de l'obstacle", the masculine, l'agent personnel de cette même fonction", (1936), p.213.

<sup>76</sup> L. Sirard, op. cit..

<sup>77</sup> See chp. 3 on 2:9.

<sup>78</sup> P.301.

<sup>79</sup> Bauer, s.v. κατέχω ; Gibling, pp. 181-204; Hanse, ' κατέχω ' in T.D.N.T., II, p.829; Milligan, pp. 154-157; Rigaux, pp. 593, 665; Sirard, op. cit., p.94.

<sup>80</sup> All meanings of Hebrew words translated by κατέχω are taken from B.D.B.

<sup>81</sup> s.v. κατέχω.

<sup>82</sup> s.v. κατέχω.

<sup>83</sup> G.W.H. Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon, Oxford, 1964, p.731.

<sup>84</sup> Cf. 8:10; III Bar. 8:6.

<sup>85</sup> Most studies of the use of the verb in the N.T. draw this two-fold distinction (Bauer, Hanse, Milligan).

<sup>86</sup> Lk. 14:9 (the proud man may have to take (κατέχειν the lowest seat) and Acts 27:40 (nautical term 'steer for'). Cf. the noun κατέχευσις , Acts 7:5,45; Heb. 1:5 = Ps. 2:7f.

<sup>87</sup> Gibling, pp. 185-192 denies the connotation of restrain in Rom. 1:18; 7:6 and Phlm. 13. In each text he tries to find the idea of 'seize' but only by straining the passage does he manage this.

<sup>88</sup> Pp. 192-201.

<sup>89</sup> His statement, κατέχω connotes violent seizure and can mean 'lay hold of', lacks proof.

<sup>90</sup>We must not equate κατέγω with κρατέω (cf. Frame, pp. 207f.). Gibling, p.172 n.3., notes the latter verb carries the connotation of 'power over', i.e. domination. So Liddell-Scott s.v. κρατέω (hold sway, rule, conquer).

<sup>91</sup>To that extent we agree with Rigaux, p. 593; Sirard, op. cit., pp. 89ff. and Gibling, p.17 against Hanse, ibid, who considers that the sense of 'hold fast' pre-dominates in the LXX.

<sup>92</sup>Moule, p.104, says a neut.ptc. + art. is virtually a noun, especially an abstract noun; cites II.2:6. Cf. Bl.-Deb. para. 413 (3); Moulton-Turner, pp. 150f.; E. Mayser, op. cit., p. 346.

<sup>93</sup>Frame, Best, ad loc.

<sup>94</sup>Above all, Rigaux pp. 663ff., who argues strongly that Paul is giving new knowledge to the Thessalonians and τὰ ὅσα = vv.3,4. If it is new knowledge it would appear difficult for the Thessalonians to grasp immediately.

<sup>95</sup>ὅσα δέ or καὶ ἄλλα

<sup>96</sup>See below in the text.

<sup>97</sup>(1936), p.212; Dibelius, ad loc.

<sup>98</sup>Bl.-Deb. para. 442 (15).

<sup>99</sup>ὅσα in I and II; I.1:4,5; 2:1,2,5,11; 3:3,4; 4:2,4,5; 5:2,12; II.1:8; 2:6; 3:7. ὅσα + ὅτι is frequent in Paul, e.g. Rom. 2:2; 3:19; I Cor. 3:16; Gal. 2:16; + a direct obj. (personal knowledge from experience) I Cor. 16:16; II Cor. 9:2.

<sup>100</sup>Pp. 159-166.

<sup>101</sup>Cf. too Plummer, p.56.

<sup>102</sup>Pp. 205ff.

<sup>103</sup>Best also has problems with εἰς τὸ because he regards τὸ κατ. and αὐτὸν (v.6), as hostile powers, see p.301.

<sup>104</sup>See comments on εἰς τὸ, chp. 2. Cf. for one thing giving way to another with the use of the εἰς τὸ construction, Gal. 3:23; 1 Pet. 1:6. If it is introducing result, 2:6, the meaning is hardly affected.

by <sup>105</sup>ἐσθηκότη <sup>cf. βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως</sup> , Mk. 13:14. followed

<sup>106</sup>Moore, ad loc.

<sup>107</sup>So most scholars.

<sup>108</sup>See chp. 6 for a discussion of the verb.

<sup>109</sup>J. Barr, Biblical Words for Time (S.B.T., 33), London, 1962, pp. 47ff., as against Cullmann, Christ and Time, pp. 37ff., Cf. Rigaux, p.667 and G. Delling 'καίρος' in T.D.N.T., III, pp. 458-462, 460.

<sup>110</sup>For a study of the word and idea, see particularly, R.E. Brown, 'The Semitic Background of the New Testament MYSTERION I', Bib. 39 (1958) 426-448; II, 40 (1959) 70-87. R.E. Brown, 'The Pre-Christian Semitic Concept of "Mystery"', C.B.Q. 20 (1958), 417-443; J. Coppens, op. cit., pp. 142-165; F.H. Furfey, 'The Mystery of Lawlessness', C.B.Q. 8 (1946), 179-191; E. Hatch, Biblical Essays, Oxford, 1889, pp. 57-62; Rigaux, pp. 272f. and 'Révélation Des Mystères et Perfection à Qumran et Dans le Nouveau Testament', N.T.S. 4 (1957/58), 237-262; J.A. Robinson, op. cit., pp. 234-240; E.E. Schneider, 'Mysterium iniquitatis. Das heilige Geheimnis der Sünde', Th.Z. 19 (1963) 113-125; Westcott, op. cit. pp. 180ff.

<sup>111</sup>Milligan, ad loc.

<sup>112</sup>E.g. J.A. Robinson, Westcott, both ibid. Best, ad loc.

<sup>113</sup>We basically agree with the meanings attached to the word by Brown in his two articles in Biblica 1958 and 1959.

<sup>114</sup>E.g. Coppens, Betz, op. cit.

<sup>115</sup>Op. cit., pp. 102ff.

<sup>116</sup>Brown, (1958), p.436 and Rigaux, N.T.S. 4 (1957/58), p.243.

<sup>117</sup>Op. cit., pp.279ff.: 'restrain the mysteries of sin' is equated with ὁ κατέχων and 'shall be no more' with ἐκ πέσου γένηται.

<sup>118</sup>Bornemann, von Dobschütz, and Masson, ad loc.

<sup>119</sup>Ellicot, ad. loc.

<sup>120</sup>Theodoret, τῆς ἀνομίας παλῆν : Anomia  
(personified) lays a snare.

<sup>121</sup>Frame, Rigaux, ad. loc.

<sup>122</sup>Neil, (Moffatt), p. 166.

<sup>123</sup>Chrysostom, Theodoret.

<sup>124</sup>Cf. Grimm-Thayer, p.420 "secret purpose formed by lawlessness"; Hatch, op. cit., p.59 "The secret purpose or counsel of lawlessness is already working".

<sup>125</sup>pp. 210ff.

<sup>126</sup>Strobel, op. cit., has es referring to the Mystery of lawlessness.

<sup>127</sup>p. 247.

<sup>128</sup>Frame, Best, et al., ad. loc.

<sup>129</sup>Andriessen, op. cit., pp. 21ff.

<sup>130</sup>H.W. Fulford, 'Εως ἐκ μέσου γένηται,  
II Thess. 2:7', E.T. 23 (1911/12), 40-41.

<sup>131</sup>See Bauer, s.v. γίνομαι 4.c

<sup>132</sup>Cf. Theophylact, παραχωρήσει αὐτὸν εἰλεῖν.

<sup>133</sup>Position of θεός is emphatic, Plummer,  
Frame, ad. loc.

<sup>134</sup>This must not be watered down to mean merely 'permit', (as Theodore, Theophylact) but regarded as a positive judgment of God in punishing sin with sin, Ldnemann, Masson, Bailey, ad. loc. On κέρπω τινα cf. I Cor. 4:17; Phil. 2:19.

<sup>135</sup>Irrespective of whether καί itself is consecutive 'so' (Plummer, ad. loc.) or designates only the correspondence of guilt and punishment. The passage shows clearly that their rejection is followed by punishment. To be strictly accurate κριθῶσιν means judged (as Chrysostom notes) but the thought of punishment is derived from the context (Milligan, ad. loc.).



<sup>136</sup>So Adeney, ad. loc. Cf. Theophylact καὶ ἐκράτησεν αὐτοὺς τὸ ψεῦδος.

<sup>137</sup>We agree with previous theocentric theories in so far as they point to the Katechōn as God, but we regard the role of God in terms of restraining evil and then unleashing it as a punishment for sin, rather than any idea of delay (Strobel, op. cit.) or preaching the gospel = will of God (Theodore, Theodoret).

<sup>138</sup>R. Kattina spoke of a thousand year period of desolation, Sanh. 97a, and R. Hanan b. Tahlifa reported a scroll which mentioned an evil period occurring 4231 years after the Creation, Sanh. 97b. Cf. other statements by the rabbis on an evil period before the End, Sanh. 97a - 98b.

<sup>139</sup>Except it reads עַבְרִי for M.T. עִבְרִי

<sup>140</sup>Cf. Isho-dad of Meir, in Horae Semiticae: Commentaries (ed. M.D. Gibson, XI. Pt. 2), Cambridge, 1913, pp. 88f. "Satan, since the coming of our Lord hath this project, how he is able to hurt men; nevertheless God hindereth him ... The Interpreter says that (Paul) sometimes calls that which withholds His care and sometimes His fiat", (translator's italics).

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CITED IN THE THESIS

(excluding reference books whose descriptions  
are found at the front of this thesis)

- Abel, F.M. Les Livres des Maccabées, 2nd edn., Paris, 1949.
- Adeney, W.F. Thessalonians and Galatians (Century Bible),  
Edinburgh, n.d.
- Alford, H. The Greek Testament (rev. by E.F. Harrison,  
Vols. III and IV), Chicago, 1958.
- Allegro, J.M. Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan, V,  
Qumran Cave IV, Oxford, 1968.
- Andriessen, P. 'Celvi qui retient la venue du Seigneur  
(2 Thess. 2,6) ( τὸ κατέχον )', Bijdragen 21  
(1960) 20-30.
- Arai, S. 'Die Gegner des Paulus im I Korinthebrief und das  
Problem der Gnosis', N.T.S. 19 (1972/73) 430-437.
- Argyle, A.W. 'Parallels between the Pauline Epistles and Q',  
E.T. 60 (1948/49) 318-320.
- idem. 'I John iii.4f.', E.T. 65 (1953/54) 62-63
- idem. 'M and the Pauline Epistles', E.T. 81 (1969/70)  
340-342.
- Askwith, H. 'The Eschatological Setting of I Thessalonians',  
Exp. VIII, 1, 59-67.
- idem. ' "I" and "We" in the Thessalonian Epistles',  
Exp. VIII, 1, 149-159.
- idem. An Introduction to the Thessalonian Epistles,  
London, 1902.
- Bacon, B.W. The Gospel of Mark: Its Composition and Date,  
New Haven, 1925.
- Bailey, J.W. 'The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians',  
in The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. XI, Nashville,  
Tenn., 1955.
- Barr, J. Biblical Words for Time (S.B.Th., 33), London, 1962.
- Barrett, C.K. The Gospel According to St. John, London, 1955.
- idem. The First Epistle to the Corinthians  
(B1.N.T.C.), London, 1968.

- Barthélemy, D. and Milik, J.T. Discoveries in the Judean Desert, I, Qumran Cave I, Oxford, 1955.
- Bauer, W. Das Johannesevangelium (H.Z.N.T., 2nd edn.), Tübingen, 1925.
- Beare, F.W. The Earliest Records of Jesus, Oxford, 1962.
- Beasley-Murray, G.R. 'The Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', J.Th.S. 48 (1947) 1-12.
- idem. Jesus and the Future, London, 1954.
- Behm, J. 'Ἰωάννης' in T.D.N.T., IV, pp. 951-960.
- Bernard, J.H. Gospel of St. John (I.C.C., Vol. I), Edinburgh, 1928.
- Bertram, G. 'ἐν ἐπεφύεω - εἰς' in T.D.N.T., II, pp. 652-654.
- Best, E. One Body in Christ, London, 1955.
- idem. I Peter (N. Cen. B.), London, 1971.
- idem. The Temptation and the Passion: The Marcan Soteriology (S.N.T.S., 2), Cambridge, 1965.
- idem. A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians (Bl.N.T.C.), London, 1972.
- Betz, O. 'Der Katechon', N.T.S. 9 (1962/63) 276-291.
- Bicknell, E.J. The First & Second Epistles to the Thessalonians (Westminster Commentary), London, 1932.
- Bigg, C. The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude (I.C.C.), Edinburgh, 1901.
- Billings, J.S. 'Judas Iscariot in the Fourth Gospel', E.T. 51 (1939/40) 156-157.
- Bjerkelund, C.J. Parakalô Form, Funktion und Sinn der parakalô - Sätze in den paulischen Briefen (Bibliotheca Theol. Norvegica, 1), Oslo, 1967.
- Black, M. 'The Messiah in the Testament of Levi XVIII', E.T. 60 (1948/49) 321-322.
- idem. E.T. (1949/50) 157-158 (A reply to J.R. Porter's view).
- idem. The Book of Enoch (Ps. V.T.G., III), Leiden, 1970.
- Blackwood, Ezekiel: Prophecy of Hope, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1965.

- Boor, W.de Die Briefe des Paulus an die Thessalonicher, erklärt, Wuppertal, 1960.
- idem. Die Apostelgeschichte, Wuppertal, 1965.
- Bornemann, W. Die Thessalonicherbriefe (Meyer, 6th edn.), Göttingen, 1894.
- Bornkamm, G. 'Paulus, Apostel' in R.G.G., V.
- Bousset, W. 'Antichrist' in Enc. Bib., I, Cols. 177-184.
- idem. The Antichrist Legend (transl. by A.H. Keane), London, 1896.
- idem. Die Offenbarung Johannis (Meyer, 2nd edn.), Göttingen, 1906.
- idem. 'Antichrist' in Enc. Reliq. and Ethics, I, pp. 578ff.
- Bousset, W. and Cheyne, T.K. 'Belial' in Enc. Bib., I, Cols. 525-527.
- Bousset, W. and Gressmann, H. Die Religion des Judentums (H.Z.N.T., 3rd edn.), Tübingen, 1966.
- Bowman, J.W. 'Eschatology in the N.T.' in I.D.B., II, pp. 135-140.
- Braun, H. 'Zur nicht paulischen Herkunft des zweiten Thessalonicherbriefes', Z.N.W. 44 (1952/53) 152ff.
- idem. Qumran und das Neue Testament, Vol. I, Tübingen, 1966.
- Bright, J. 'Day of the Lord' in H.D.B. (One Vol. ed. F.C. Grant, H.H. Rowley, 2nd edn.), Edinburgh, 1963, p.203.
- Brock, S.P. Testamentum Iobi (Ps. V.T.G., II), Leiden, 1967.
- Brown, J.P. 'Synoptic Parallels in the Epistles and Form-History', N.T.S. 10 (1963/64) 27-48.
- Brown, R.E. 'The Semitic Background of the New Testament MYSTERION, I', Bib. 39 (1958) 426-448; II, Bib. (1959) 70-87.
- idem. 'The Pre-Christian Semitic Concept of "Mystery"', C.B.Q. 20 (1958) 417-443.
- idem. New Testament Essays, London, 1965.
- idem. The Gospel According to St. John (Anchor Bible, 2 Vols.), London, 1966 and 1971.

- idem. 'The Teacher of Righteousness and the Messiah(s)' in The Scrolls and Christianity (ed. M. Black), London, 1969, pp. 37-44.
- Brown, S. Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke (Analecta Biblica, 35/36), Rome, 1968.
- Brown, W.A. 'Parousia' in H.D.B., III, pp. 674-680.
- Büchsel, F. 'καταδίκη' in T.D.N.T., II, pp. 169-172.
- Bultmann, R. The Theology of the New Testament (transl. K. Grobel, 2 Vols.), London, 1952, 1955.
- idem. Das Evangelium des Johannes (Meyer, 18th edn.), Göttingen, 1964.
- idem. History of the Synoptic Tradition (transl. by J. Marsh, 2nd edn.), London, 1968.
- Burg, 'Die hemmende Macht im 2 Thessalonicher Brief', Pastor Bonus 25 (1913) 610-615.
- Burton, E.D. The Epistle to the Galatians (I.C.C.), Edinburgh, 1921.
- Bussmann, C. Themen der paulinischen Missionspredigt auf dem Hintergrund der spätjüdisch - hellenistischen Missionsliteratur (Europäische Hochschulschriften Reihe 23, Vol. 3), Bern-Frankfurt, 1971.
- Buzy, D. 'L'Adversaire et l'obstacle: II Thess., 2,3-12', R.de S.R. 24 (1934) 402-431.
- Caird, G.B. The Gospel of St. Luke (Pelican Gospel Comm.), London, 1963.
- idem. The Revelation of St. John the Divine (B1.N.T.C.), London, 1966.
- Calvin, J. The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians (transl. R. Mackenzie), Edinburgh, 1961.
- Campbell, T.H. 'Paul's "Missionary Journeys" as reflected in his letters', J.B.L. 74 (1955) 80-87.
- Cerfaux, L. Christ in the Theology of St. Paul, Edinburgh-London, 1959.
- Charles, R.H. The Assumption of Moses, London, 1897.
- idem. Hebrew, Jewish and Christian Eschatology, London, 1899.
- idem. The Ascension of Isaiah, London, 1900.



- idem.            The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,  
London, 1908.
- idem.            The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the  
Twelve Patriarchs, Oxford, 1908.
- idem.            Religious Developments Between the Old and  
the New Testaments, London, 1919.
- idem.            The Revelation of St. John (I.C.C., 2 Vols.),  
Edinburgh, 1920.
- Cheyne, T.K.    'The Development of the Meanings of Belial',  
Exp. V. 1. 435-439.
- Clark, K.W.    'The Meaning of ἐνσπύριον and κατασπύριον  
in the New Testament', J.B.L. 54 (1935) 93-101.
- Conzelmann, H.    The Theology of St. Luke (transl. by  
G. Buswell), London, 1960.
- idem.            Die Apostelgeschichte (H.Z.N.T.), Tübingen,  
1963.
- idem.            Der erste Brief an die Korinther (Meyer,  
11th edn.), Göttingen, 1969.
- Cook, S.A.    The Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Light of  
Archaeology (Schweich Lectures for 1925), London,  
1931.
- Coppens, J.    'Le "mystère" dans la Théologie Paulienne et ses  
paralleles Qumrâniens' in Littérature et Théologie:  
Recherches Bibliques V (ed. A. Descamps), Louvain,  
1960, pp. 142-165 = Paul and Qumran (ed. J.M.-O'Connor),  
pp. 132-158.
- Cothenet, E.    'La Deuxieme Épître aux Thessaloniens et  
l'Apocalypse Synoptique', R.de S.R. 42 (1954) 5-39.
- Creed, J.M.    The Gospel According to St. Luke, London, 1930.
- Cullmann, O.    'Le caractère eschatologique du devoir  
missionnaire et de la conscience apostolique de  
St. Paul. Étude sur le κατέχον (-ων) de  
2 Thess. 2,6-7', R.H.P.R. 16 (1936) 210-245.
- idem.            Christ and Time (transl. by F.V. Filson),  
London, 1951.
- Dancy, J.C.    A Commentary on I Maccabees, Oxford, 1954.
- Daube, D.    The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (Jordan  
Lectures 1952), London, 1956.
- Davidson, A.B.    'Eschatology' in H.D.B., I, pp. 735-738.



- Davies, J.G. 'The Genesis of Belief in an Imminent Parousia', J.Th.S. 14 (1963) 104-107.
- Davies, W.D. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, London, 1948.
- Deissmann, A. Bible Studies (transl. by A. Grieve), Edinburgh, 1903.
- idem. Light from the Ancient East (transl. by L.R.M. Strachan), London, 1927.
- Delling, G. 'καίρὸς' in T.D.N.T., III, pp. 458-462.
- Denis, A.-M. Introduction aux Pseudépigraphes Grecs d'Ancien Testament, Leiden, 1970.
- Denny, J. The Epistles to the Thessalonians (Expositor's Bible), London, 1892.
- Dibelius, M. An die Thessalonicher I-II: an die Philipper (H.Z.N.T., 2nd edn.), Tübingen, 1923: 3rd edn., Tübingen, 1937.
- Dibelius, M. and Conzelmann, H. Die Pastoralbriefe (H.Z.N.T., 4th edn.), Tübingen, 1966.
- Dick, K. Der Schriftstellerische Plural bei Paulus, Halle, 1890.
- Dobschütz, E. von Die Thessalonicher-Briefe (Meyer, 7th edn.), Göttingen, 1909.
- Dodd, C.H. The Bible and the Greeks, London, 1935.
- idem. The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments, London, 1936.
- idem. The Parables of the Kingdom, London, 1936.
- idem. 'Matthew and Paul', E.T. 48 (1946/47) 293-294.
- idem. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, Cambridge, 1953.
- idem. Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel, Cambridge, 1963.
- Driver, S.R. 'The Abomination of Desolation' in H.D.B., I, pp. 12ff.
- idem. Deuteronomy (I.C.C.), Edinburgh, 1896.
- Dunand, F. Le culte d'Isis dans le bassin oriental de la Méditerranée, Vol. II, Leiden, 1973.
- Dupont, J. Συν Χριστῶν : L'union avec le Christ suivant Saint Paul, Bruges, 1952.

- Eadie, J. Commentary on the Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians, London, 1877.
- Eckart, K.-G. 'Der zweite echte Brief des Apostels Paulus an die Thessalonicher', Z.Th.K. 58 (1961) 30-44.
- Edson, C. 'Cults of Thessalonica (Macedonia III)', H.Th.R. 41 (1948) 153-204.
- Egenwolf, H.-A. 'The Second Epistle to the Thessalonians' in The Two Epistles to the Thessalonians (N.T. for Spiritual Reading), London, 1969.
- Eichrodt, W. Ezekiel (transl. by C. Quin), London, 1970.
- Eissfeldt, O. The Old Testament. An Introduction (transl. P.R. Ackroyd), Oxford, 1966.
- Ellicott, C.J. Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians, London, 1858.
- Ellis, E.E. The Gospel of Luke (N. Cen. B.), London, 1966.
- idem. Paul's Use of the Old Testament, London, 1957.
- Ernst, J. Die Eschatologischen Gegenspieler in den Schriften des Neuen Testament (Biblische Untersuchungen, 3), Regensburg, 1967.
- Eschlimann, J.A. 'La Rédaction des Épîtres Pauliniennes', R.B. 53 (1946) 185-195.
- Evans, C.F. Resurrection and the New Testament (S.B.Th., 2nd Series, 12), London, 1970.
- Findlay, G.G. The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Thessalonians (G.C.T.), Cambridge, 1925.
- Fitchner, J. Wisheit Salomos (H.Z.A.T.), Tübingen, 1938.
- Fitzmyer, J.A. 'Paul and the Interpolated Paragraph in 2 Cor. 6:14 - 7:1', C.B.Q. 33 (1961) 271-280.
- idem. The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I (Biblica et Orientalia, 18), Rome, 1966.
- Forestell, J.T. 'The Letters to the Thessalonians', in J.B.C.
- Foerster, W. 'Βελίαρ' in T.D.N.T., I, p.607.
- idem. 'δία/βολος' in T.D.N.T., II, pp. 75-81
- idem. 'κυρίος' in T.D.N.T., III, pp. 1081-1095.

- idem. 'ρωζω' in T.D.N.T., VII, pp.965-1003.
- Frame, J.E. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians (I.C.C.), Edinburgh, 1912.
- Freese, N.F. 'τὸ κατέχον und ὁ κατέχων (II Thess. 2,6-7)', Th.S.K. 93 (1920/21) 73-77.
- Frey, J.B. 'Apocryphes de l'A.T.' in Dictionnaire de la Bible, Suppl.1, 1928.
- Friedrich, G. 'Ein Tauflied hellenistische Judenchristen, I Thess. 1:9f.', Th.Z. 21 (1965) 502-516.
- idem. 'I Thessalonicher, 5,1-11, der apologetische Einschub eines Späteren', Z.Th.K. 70 (1973) 288-315.
- Fritsch, C.T. 'Pseudepigrapha' in I.D.B., III, p.391.
- Frost, S.B. 'Abomination that makes desolate' in I.D.B., I, p.14.
- Funk, R.W. 'The Apostolic Parousia: Form and Significance' in Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to J. Knox (ed. W.R. Farmer, C.F.D. Moule, R.R. Niebuhr), Cambridge, 1967.
- Fulford, H.W. 'Ἐως ἐκ πέσου γένηται', II Thess. 2,7', E.T. 23 (1911/12) 40-41.
- Furfey, P.H. 'The Mystery of Lawlessness', C.B.Q. 8 (1946) 179-191.
- Gärtner, B. The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament (S.N.T.S., 1), Cambridge, 1965.
- Gaster, T.H. 'Belial' in I.D.B., I, p.377.
- idem. 'Satan' in I.D.B., IV, pp. 224-228.
- Gaston, L. No Stone on Another (N.T. Suppl., 23), Leiden, 1970.
- Giblin, C.H. The Threat to Faith: An Exegetical and Theological Re-examination of 2 Thessalonians 2 (Analecta Biblica, 31), Rome, 1967.
- Glasson, T.F. 'Mk. xiii and the Greek Old Testament', E.T. 69 (1957/58) 213-215.
- idem. 'The Ensign of the Son of Man (Mt. 24:30)', J.Th.S. 15 (1964), 299-300.
- Gnilka, J. 'II Cor. 6:14 - 7:1 in the Light of the Qumran Texts and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs' in Paul and Qumran (ed. J.M.-O'Connor), London, 1968.

- Grant, F.C. The Gospels: Their Origin and Growth, London, 1959.
- Grant, R.M. A Historical Introduction to the New Testament, London, 1936.
- idem. The Apostolic Fathers, Vol. I, New York, 1964.
- Grayston, K. The Letters of Paul to the Philippians and to the Thessalonians (Camb. Bible Comm.), Cambridge, 1967.
- Grayston, K. and Herdan, G. 'The Authorship of the Pastorals in the Light of Statistical Linguistics', N.T.S. 6 (1959/60) 1-15.
- Greeven, H. 'ἐρωτάω' in T.D.N.T., II, p. 685-687.
- Gregson, R. 'A Solution to the Problem of the Thessalonian Letters', Ev.Q. 38 (1966) 76-80.
- Griffiths, J.G. '2 Thessalonians ii.4', E.T. 52 (1940/41) 38.
- Gutbrod, W. 'ἀνομία, ἄνομος' in T.D.N.T., IV, pp. 1085ff.
- Gunkel, H. Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit, Göttingen, 1895.
- Hadorn, W. 'Die Abfassung des Thessalonicherbriefe in der Zeit der dritten Missionreise des Paulus', B.F.Th. 24 (1919/20) 67ff.
- idem. 'Die Abfassung der Thessalonicherbriefe auf den dritten Missionreise und der Canon des Marcion', Z.N.W. 19 (1919/20) 67-72.
- Haenchen, E. Die Apostelgeschichte (Meyer, 14th edn.), Göttingen, 1965.
- Hanse, H. 'κτείνω' in T.D.N.T., II, p.829.
- Hanson, A.T. The Wrath of the Lamb, London, 1957.
- Hanson, R.P.C. 'St. Paul's Quotations of the Book of Job', Theology 53 (1950) 250-253.
- Harnack, A. 'Das Problem des zweiten Thessalonicherbriefe', in Sitzungsberichte der Königlich-preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-historische Klasse, Pt. I, Berlin, 1910, pp. 560-578.
- Harnisch, W. Eschatologische Existenz. Ein exegetischer Beitrag zum sachanliegen von I. Thessalonicher 4:13-5:11 (F.R.L.A.N.T., 110), Göttingen, 1973.

- Hartl, V. 'ὁ κατέχων ἄρτι', 2 Thess 2,7', Z.K.Th. 45 (1921) 455-475.
- Hartman, L. Prophecy Interpreted (Coniectanea Biblica, 1), Lund, 1966.
- Hatch, E. Biblical Essays, Oxford, 1889.
- Hengel, M. Judaism and Hellenism (transl. by J. Bowden, 2 Vols.), London, 1974.
- Hill, D. 'On the Evidence for the Creative Role of Christian Prophets', N.T.S. 20 (1973/74) 262-274.
- Hoffmann, P. Die Toten in Christus (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, N.F.2), Münster, 1966.
- Holm-Nielsen, S. Hodayot Psalms from Qumran (Acta Theologica Danica, II), Aarhus, 1960.
- Hornbostel, W. Sarapis, Leiden, 1973.
- Huppenbauer, H.W. 'Belial in den Qumrantexten', Th.Z. 15 (1959) 81-89.
- Isho-dad of Meir in Horae Semiticae: Commentaries (ed. M.D. Gibson, XI, Pt. 2), Cambridge, 1913.
- James, M.R. 'Man of Sin and Antichrist' in H.D.B., III, p.277.
- idem. 'The Testament of Job' in Apocrypha Anecdota, II (ed. J.A. Robinson, Cambridge Texts and Studies, V), Cambridge, 1899.
- Jeffrey, A. 'The Book of Daniel' in The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. VI, Nashville, Tenn., 1956.
- Jenni, E. 'Day of the Lord' in I.D.B., I, pp. 784f.
- Jeremias, J. The Parables of Jesus (transl. by S.H. Hooke), London, 1963.
- idem. Unknown Sayings of Jesus (transl. by R.H. Fuller, 2nd edn.), London, 1964.
- idem. New Testament Theology, Pt. I. The Proclamation of Jesus (transl. by J. Bowden), London, 1971.
- Jewett, R. Paul's Anthropological Terms (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, 10), Leiden, 1971.
- Johnson, P.F. 'The use of Statistics in the Analysis of the Characteristics of Pauline Writing', N.T.S. 20 (1973/74) 92-100.



- Johnson, S.E. The Gospel According to St. Mark (B1.N.T.C.), London, 1960.
- Jöten, P. 'Belial', Bib. 5 (1924) 178-183.
- Kaiser, O. Isaiah, 13-39 (transl. by R.A. Wilson), London, 1973.
- Kamlah, E. 'Geist' in Begriffslexicon zum N.T., Vol. I. Wuppertal, 1967.
- Kasch, W. 'סוּפָּאָל', in T.D.N.T., VI, pp. 998-1003.
- Kater-Sibbes, G.J.F. Preliminary Catalogue of Sarapis Monuments, Leiden, 1973.
- Kaye, B.N. 'Eschatology and Ethics in 1 and 2 Thessalonians', N.T. 17 (1975) 47-57.
- Keil, C.F. Commentar über Die Bücher der Makkabäer, Leipzig, 1875.
- Kissane, E.J. The Book of Isaiah, Vol. I, Dublin, 1960.
- Kittel, G. 'Der Jakobusbrief und die Apostolischen Väter', Z.N.W. 43 (1951/52) 54-112.
- Klijn, A.F.J. An Introduction to the New Testament (transl. by M. van der Vathorst-Smit), Leiden, 1967.
- Klostermann, E. Kleine Texte, 2nd edn., Bonn, 1908.
- idem. Das Markus-Evangelium (H.Z.N.T., 2nd edn.), Tübingen, 1926, (4th edn. 1950).
- Knox, J. Chapters in a Life of Paul, New York, 1950.
- Knox, R. New Testament Commentary, Vol. II, London, 1954.
- Kohler, K. 'The Testament of Job, An Essene Midrash on the Book of Job' in Semitic Studies in Memory A. Kohut, Berlin, 1897.
- idem. 'The Testament of Job' in Jewish Encyclopedia, (ed. I. Singer, Vol. VII), London-New York, 1904, pp. 200-202.
- Kosmala, H. Hebräer-Essener-Christen (Studia Post Biblica, 1), Leiden, 1959.
- Kraft, R.A. The Apostolic Fathers, Vol. III, New York, 1965.
- Kuhn, K.G. 'Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel' in The Scrolls and the New Testament (ed. K. Stendhal), London, 1958, pp. 54-64.



- Kümmel, W.G. Introduction to the New Testament (transl. by A.J. Mattill), London, 1966.
- idem. 'Das literarische und geschichtliche Problem des ersten Thessalonicherbriefs' in Neotestamentica et Patristica, Freundesgabe O. Cullmann (N.T. Suppl., 6), Leiden, 1962, pp. 213-227.
- Lake, K. The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul, London, 1911.
- Lambrecht, J. Die Redaktion der Markus - Apokalypse: Literarische Analyse und Strukturuntersuchung (Analecta Biblica, 28), Rome, 1967.
- Lampe, G.W.H. A Patristic Greek Lexicon, Oxford, 1964.
- Leaney, A.R.C. The Gospel According to St. Luke (B.I.N.T.C.), London, 1958.
- idem. The Role of Qumran and its Meaning, London, 1966.
- Leitzmann, H. An die Korinther I.II (H.Z.N.T., 2nd edn.), Tübingen, 1923.
- idem. An die Galater (H.Z.N.T., 2nd edn.), Tübingen 1923.
- Leitzmann, H. and Kümmel, An Die Korinther I.II (H.Z.N.T., 4th edn.), Tübingen, 1949.
- Lightfoot, J.B. Notes on Epistles of St. Paul, London, 1904.
- Lightfoot, R.H. St. John's Gospel (ed. C.F. Evans), Oxford, 1956.
- Lindars, B. New Testament Apologetic, London, 1961.
- idem. The Gospel of John (N. Cen. B.), London, 1972.
- Ling, T. The Significance of Satan, London, 1961.
- Lofthouse, W.F. 'Singular and Plural in St. Paul's Epistles', E.T. 58 (1946/47) 179-182.
- idem. '"I" and "We" in the Pauline Letters', E.T. 64 (1952/53) 241-245.
- Lohmeyer, E. and Schmauch, W. Das Evangelium des Matthäus (Meyer, 4th edn.), Göttingen, 1967.
- Loisy, A.F. L'Apocalypse de Jean, Paris, 1923.
- Lührmann, D. 'Epiphaneia. Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte eines griechischen Wortes' in Tradition und Glaube. Festgabe für K.G. Kuhn (ed. G. Jeremias, H.-W. Kuhn and H. Stegemann), Göttingen, 1971, pp.185-199.

- Lüdemann, G. Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament: The Epistles to the Thessalonians (transl. by P.J. Gloag from the 3rd edn. Meyer), Edinburgh, 1880.
- McArthur, H.K. 'Parousia' in I.D.B., III, pp.658f.
- idem. 'Κωι' Frequency in Greek Letters', N.T.S. 15 (1968/69) 339-349.
- McCasland, S.V. 'Signs and Wonders', J.B.L. 76 (1957) 149-152.
- McKelvey, R.J. The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament (Oxford Theol. Monographs), Oxford, 1969.
- Manson, T.W. Studies in the Gospels and Epistles, Manchester, 1962, pp.259-278 (orig. pub. B.J.R.L. 35 (1952/53) 428ff.)
- Marksen, W. Der Evangelist Markus, Göttingen, 2nd edn., 1959.
- idem. Introduction to the New Testament (transl. by G. Buswell), Oxford, 1968.
- idem. 'Auslegung von I Thess. 4:13-18', Z.Th.K. 66 (1969) 22-37.
- Masson, C. Les Deux Épîtres de Saint Paul aux Thessaloniens (Commentaire du N.T., XIa), Neuchâtel-Paris, 1957.
- || May, D.M. Glory at the Right Hand, (Soc. Bib. Lit. Mon., 18), New York, 1973.
- May, H.G. 'The Book of Ezekiel' in The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. VI., Nashville, Tenn., 1956.
- Mayor, J.B. 'The Epistle of St. James, London, 1913.
- Mayser, E. Grammatik der Griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit, II.1, Berlin, 1926.
- Metzger, B. A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, London-New York, 1971.
- Michaelson, S. and Morton, A.Q. 'Last Words: A Test of Authorship for Greek Writers', N.T.S. 18 (1970/71) 192-208.
- Michel, O. -- Der Brief an die Römer (Meyer, 13th edn.), Göttingen, 1966.
- Milik, J.T. 'Le Testament de Lévi en araméen, fragment de la grotte 4 de Qumran', R.B. 62 (1955), 398-406.
- idem. in Le Travail d'Édition des Fragments Manuscrits de Qumrân', R.B. 63 (1956) 49-67.

- idem.        Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea (transl. by J. Strugnell, S.B.T., 26), London, 1959.
- idem.        'Problèmes de la Littérature Hénochique à la Lumière des Fragments Araméens de Qumrân, H.Th.R. 64 (1971) 333-378.
- Milligan, G.   St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians, London, 1908.
- Moffatt, J.    The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians (The Expositor's Greek Testament, Vol. IV), London, 1910.
- idem.        Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, Edinburgh, 1927.
- Montgomery, W.   The Book of Daniel (I.C.C.), Edinburgh, 1927.
- Moore, A.L.    The Parousia in the New Testament (N.T. Suppl., 13), Leiden, 1966.
- idem.        I & II Thessalonians (N. Cen. B.), London, 1969.
- Morris, L.     The Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians (Tyndale), London, 1956.
- idem.        The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians (New London Comm.), London, 1959.
- idem.        Studies in the Fourth Gospel, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1969.
- idem.        The Gospel According to St. John (New International Commentary), London, 1973.
- Morton, A.Q. and McLeman, J.   Christianity and the Computer, London, 1964.
- Moulton, J.H.   A Grammar of New Testament Greek, 3rd edn., Edinburgh, 1919.
- Munck, J.      Paul and the Salvation of Mankind (transl. by F. Clarke), London, 1959.
- idem.        'I Thess. 1:9-10 and the Missionary Preaching of Paul', N.T.S. 9 (1962/63) 95-110.
- Murphy, R.E.    'Šahat in the Qumran Literature', Bib. 39 (1958) 61-66.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J.   'Truth' in Paul and Qumran (ed. J.M.-O'Connor), London, 1968.

- Myers, J.M. I Chronicles (Anchor Bible), New York, 1965.
- Neil, W. Thessalonians (Moffat N.T. Comm.), London, 1950.
- idem. St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians (Torch Bib. Comm.), London, 1957.
- idem. 'I and II Thessalonians' in Peake's Commentary on the Bible (ed. M. Black and H.H. Rowley), London, 1962.
- Nestle, E. 'Zu Daniel', Z.N.W. 4 (1884) 247-250.
- The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers (Oxford Society of Historical Theology), Oxford, 1905.
- Nineham, D.E. The Gospel of St. Mark (Pelican Gospel Comm., rev. edn.), London, 1968.
- Oepke, A. Die Brief an die Thessalonicher (Das Neue Testament Deutsch), Göttingen, 1953.
- idem. 'ἀπωλεία' in T.D.N.T., I, pp.396-397.
- idem. 'ἀποκαλύπτω (-ψις)' in T.D.N.T., III, pp.563-592.
- idem. 'εἰς' in T.D.N.T., II, pp.420-442.
- idem. 'ἐνίστημι' in T.D.N.T., II, pp.543-544.
- idem. 'ἐξακατάω' in T.D.N.T., I, pp.384-385.
- idem. 'παρουσία' in T.D.N.T., V, pp.858-871.
- Ogg, G. The Chronology of the Life of St. Paul, London, 1968.
- Orchard, J.B. 'Thessalonians and the Synoptic Gospels', Bib. 19 (1938) 19-42.
- Osten-Sacken, P. von der Gott und Belial (Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments, 6), Göttingen, 1968.
- Parry, R. St.J. The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians (C.G.T.), Cambridge, 1957.
- Pax, E. ἘΠΙΦΑΝΕΙΑ: Ein religionsgeschichtlicher Beitrag, München, 1955.
- Pearson, B.A. '1 Th. 2:13-16 : A Deutero-Pauline Interpolation', H.Th.R. 64 (1971) 79-94.
- Peel, M.L. 'Gnostic Eschatology and the New Testament', N.T. 12 (1970) 141-165.
- Pesch, R. Naherwartungen, Düsseldorf, 1968.
- Plummer, A. A Commentary on St. Paul's First Epistle to the Thessalonians, London, 1918.

- idem.        A Commentary on St. Paul's Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, London, 1918.
- Porteous, N.    Daniel, London, 1965.
- Porter, J.R.    'The Messiah in the Testament of Levi XVIII', E.T. 61 (1949/50) 90-91.
- Potterie,       'Le Péché, c'est l'iniquité (I Joh.III,4)', Nouvelle Revue Théologique 78 (1956) 785-797.
- Prat, F.        La Théologie de Saint Paul, Vol. I, Paris, 1913.
- Rad, G.von     'διάβολος' in T.D.N.T., II, pp.71-75.
- idem.         'ἡμέρα, O.T.' in T.D.N.T., II, pp.943-947.
- Ramsay, W.M.   St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen, London, 1895.
- idem.         'The Greek of the Early Church and the Pagan Ritual', E.T. 10 (1898/99) 208-209.
- Resch, A.       'Der Paulinismus und die Logia' in T.U., 12, Leipzig, 1904.
- Richardson, P. Israel in the Apostolic Church (S.N.T.S., 10), Cambridge, 1969.
- Riesenfeld, H. 'ὁ κέρ' in T.D.N.T., VIII, pp. 507-516.
- Rigaux, B.     L'Antéchrist et l'opposition au royaume messianique dans l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament, Paris, 1932.
- idem.         Saint Paul: Les Épîtres aux Thessaloniens, Paris, 1956.
- idem.         'Révélation Des Mystères et Perfection à Qumran et Dans le Nouveau Testament', N.T.S. 4 (1957/58) 237-262.
- idem.         'Tradition et Rédaction dans I Th. V.1-10', N.T.S. 21 (1974/75) 318-340.
- Rist, M.        'Antichrist' in I.D.B., I, pp. 140-143.
- idem.         'Day of Christ' in I.D.B., I, p.783.
- idem.         'Pseudepigraphy and the Early Christians' in Studies in the New Testament and Early Christianity (ed. D.E. Aune, N.T. Suppl., 33), Leiden, 1972, pp. 82ff.
- Robertson, A. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament, London, 1914.



- Robertson, A. and Plummer, A. The First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (I.C.C.), Edinburgh, 1914.
- Robinson, D.W.B. '2 Thess. 2,6: "That which restrains" or "That which holds sway"? ' in Studia Evangelica, T.U., 102, Berlin, 1968.
- Robinson, J.A. St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, London, 1903.
- Roetzel, C. 'The Judgement Form in Paul's Letters', J.B.L. 88 (1969) 305ff.
- idem. Judgement in the Community, Leiden, 1972.
- Ross, J. 'Ἐνερπεῖσθαι in the New Testament', Exp. VII. 7, 75-77.
- Rostowzew, M. 'Ἐπιφάνεια', Klio 16 (1920) 203-206.
- Rowley, H.H. 'The Bilingual Problem of Daniel', Z.A.W. 50 (1932) 256-268.
- idem. The Relevance of the Apocalyptic, 3rd edn., London, 1963.
- Russell, D.S. The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, London, 1964.
- Sand, A. 'Die Polemik gegen "Gesetzlosigkeit" im Evangelium nach Matthäus und bei Paul', B.Z. 14 (1970) 112-125.
- Sanders, J.N. and Mastin, B.A. The Gospel According to St. John (B.I.N.T.C.), London, 1968.
- Schäfer, A. Erklärung der zwei Briefe an die Thessalonicher, Münster, 1890.
- Schelkle, Die Petrusbriefe. Der Judusbrief (K.Z.N.T.), Freiburg, 1964.
- Schippers, R. 'The Pre-Synoptic Tradition in I Thessalonians 2:13-16', N.T. 8 (1966) 223-234.
- Schlatter, A. Die Briefe an die Thessalonicher, Philipper, Timotheus und Titus, Stuttgart, 1950.
- idem. Der Evangelist Matthäus, Stuttgart, 1957.
- Schlier, H. 'ἀποστασία, ἀφίστημι' in T.D.N.T., I, pp. 512-514.
- idem. 'ἀνρέομαι' in T.D.N.T., I, p. 470.
- idem. 'ἐκκεντέω' in T.D.N.T., II, pp. 446-447.



- idem.            Der Brief an die Galater (Meyer, 13th edn.),  
Göttingen, 1965.
- Schmiedel, P.W.    Die Briefe an die Thessalonicher und an die  
Korinther (Hand-Commentar zum N.T.), Freiburg, 1892.
- Schmid, J.        'Der Antichrist, und die hemmende Macht (2  
Thess 2, 1-12)', Th.Q. 129 (1949) 323-343.
- Schmid, J.        The Gospel According to Mark (transl. by K. Gondon,  
The Regensburg N.T.), New York, 1968.
- Schmithals, W.    Die Gnosis in Korinth: Eine Untersuchungen  
zu den Korinthbriefen, Göttingen, 1956.
- idem.            'Abfassung und ältesten Sammlung der  
Paulinischen Hauptbriefe', Z.N.W. 51 (1960) 225-245.
- idem.            Paulus und die Gnostiker (Th.F., 35),  
Hamburg, 1965.
- idem.            'Die Thessalonicherbriefe als Briefkomposition'  
in Zeit und Geschichte. Dankesgabe an R. Bultmann  
(ed. E. Dinkler), Tübingen, 1964, pp. 195-311.  
295
- Schnackenburg, R.    Die Johannesbriefe (K.Z.N.T., 3rd edn.),  
Basel, 1965.
- Schneider, E.E.    'Mysterium iniquitatis. Das heilige  
Geheimnis der Sünde', Th.Z. 19 (1963), 113-125.
- Schoedel, W.      The Apostolic Fathers, Vol. V, London, 1967.
- Schoeps, H.J.      Paul (transl. by H. Knight), London, 1961.
- Schürer, E.        The History of the Jewish People in the Age of  
Jesus Christ (ed. G. Vermes - F. Millar, Vol. I),  
Edinburgh, 1973.
- Schütz, J.H.       Paul and the Anatomy of Apostolic Authority  
(S.N.T.S., 26), Cambridge, 1975.
- Schweizer, E.      'Der zweite Thessalonicherbrief ein Philipper-  
brief?' Th.Z. 1 (1945) 282-285.
- idem.            'ἐκ νέω' in T.D.N.T., VI, p.452.
- Schweitzer, A.      The Mysticism of Paul (transl. by  
W. Montgomery), London, 1931.
- Scott, R.          The Pauline Epistles . A Critical Study,  
Edinburgh, 1909.
- Scott, R.B.Y.      'Behold he cometh with the clouds', N.T.S. 5  
(1958/59) 127-132.

- idem. 'The Book of Isaiah' in The Interpreter's Bible, Vol. V, Nashville, Tenn., 1956.
- Shaw, R.H. 'A Conjecture on the Signs of the End', Anglican Theological Review 47 (1965) 96-102.
- Simcox, W.H. The Revelation of St. John the Divine, Cambridge, 1893.
- Sirard, L. 'La Parousie de l'Antéchrist, II Thess. 2:3-9' in Analecta Biblica 17/18, Rome, 1963, pp. 89-100.
- Smith, M. 'What is implied by the variety of Messianic Figures?' J.B.L. 78 (1959) 66-72.
- Spicq, C. 'L'Épître aux Hébreux, Apollus, Jean-Baptiste, les Hellenistes et Qumran', R.Q. 1 (1958/59) 365-390.
- Staab, K. Die Thessalonicherbriefe (Regensburger N.T.), Regensburg 1965.
- Stacey, W.D. The Pauline View of Man, London, 1956.
- Stanley, D.M. 'Pauline Allusions to the Sayings of Jesus', C.B.Q. 3 (1961) 26-39.
- Stauffer, E. 'ἐγώ' in T.D.N.T., II, pp. 354-362.
- Strobel, A. Untersuchungen zum Eschatologischen Verzögerungsproblem (N.T. Suppl., 2), Leiden, 1961.
- Stuhlmacher, P. 'Das paulinische Evangelium I. Vorgeschichte (F.R.L.A.N.T., 95), Göttingen, 1968.
- Stuhlmüller, C. 'John' in J.B.C.
- idem. 'Zechariah' in J.B.C.
- Taylor, V. 'The Apocalyptic Discourse of Mk. 13', E.T. 60 (1948/49) 94-98.
- idem. The Gospel According to St. Mark, London, 1952.
- Thiselton, A.C. 'The Meaning of Σάρξ in I Cor. 5:5', S.J.Th. 26 (1973) 204-228.
- Thomas, D.W. 'בְּיָמָיו in the O.T.' in Biblical and Patristic Studies (ed. J.N. Birdsall - R.W. Thomson), Freiburg, 1963.
- Thurston, R.W. 'The Relationship Between the Thessalonian Epistles', E.T. 85 (1973/74) 52-56.
- Torrey, C.C. The Apocryphal Literature, London, 1963.
- Trilling, W. Untersuchungen zum 2. Thessalonicherbrief (Erfurter Theologische Studien, 27), Leipzig, 1972.

- Unnik, W.C. van 'La Conception Paulinienne de la Nouvelle Alliance' in Sparsa Collecta: The Collected Essays of W.C. van Unnik, Pt. I (N.T. Suppl., 29), Leiden, 1973.
- Vaux, R.de Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions (transl. by J. McHugh), London, 1961.
- Vickers, M.J. 'Hellenistic Thessalonik', J.H.S. 92 (1972) 156-170.
- Viteau, J. Les Psaumes de Salomon, Paris, 1911.
- Voltz, P. Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba, Tübingen-Leipzig, 1903.
- Vries, S.J. de 'Sin' in I.D.B., IV, pp. 361-376.
- Wakeman, M.K. God's Battle with the Monster, Leiden, 1973.
- Warfield, B.B. 'The Prophecies of St. Paul, I - 1 and 2 Thessalonians', Exp. III, 4, 30-44.
- Weeden, T.J. Mark - Traditions in Conflict, Philadelphia, 1971.
- Weiss, B. Die Paulinischen Briefe, Leipzig, 1896.
- Weiss, J. Der erste Korintherbrief (Meyer, 10th edn.), Göttingen, 1925.
- Wendland, P. 'ΣΩΤΗΡ : Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung', Z.N.W. 5 (1904) 335-353.
- Wendt, H.H. Die Apostelgeschichte (Meyer, 9th edn.), Göttingen, 1913.
- Westcott, B.F. St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, London, 1906.
- Wevers, J.W. Ezekiel (N. Cen. B.), London, 1969.
- Whitehouse, O.C. 'Satan' H.D.B., IV, pp. 407-412.
- Whiteley, D.E.H. The Theology of St. Paul, Oxford, 1964.
- idem. Thessalonians (N. Cl. B.), Oxford, 1969.
- Wilcox, M. 'The Composition of John 13:21-30' in Neotestamentica et Semitica - Studies in honour of M. Black (ed. E.E. Ellis, M. Wilcox), Edinburgh, 1969.
- Wilson, J.H. 'The Corinthians who say There is no resurrection of the Dead', Z.N.W. 59 (1968) 90-107.

Wilson, R.McL. Gnosis and the New Testament, Oxford, 1968.

idem. The Gnostic Problem, London, 1958.

idem. 'How Gnostic were the Corinthians?',  
N.T.S. 19 (1972/73) 65-74.

Wilson, S.G. 'Lukan Eschatology', N.T.S. 16 (1969/70)  
330-347.

Wohlenberg, G. Der Erste und Zweite Thessalonicherbriefe,  
2nd. edn., Leipzig, 1909.

Wrede, W. 'Die Echtheit des zweiten Thessalonicherbriefs  
untersucht' in T.U. (N.F. 9,2), Leipzig, 1903.

Yadin, Y. The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against  
the Sons of Darkness, Oxford, 1962.

Young, E.J. The Book of Isaiah (New International  
Commentary on the O.T., Vol. I), Grand Rapids,  
Mich., 1965.

Zeitlin, S. The First Book of Maccabees, New York, 1950.

idem. The Second Book of Maccabees, New York, 1954.